उपदेशसाहस्री

गद्यपद्यभागद्वयम्

A THOUSAND TEACHINGS

IN TWO PARTS—PROSE AND POETRY

OF SRÎ SANKARÂCHÂRYA

TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH WITH EXPLANATORY NOTES

BY

SWÂMI JAGADÂNANDA

SRI RAMAKRISHNA MATH

MYLAPORE, MADRAS

INDIA

1949

Published by
THE PRESIDENT
SRI RAMAKRISHNA MATH
MYLAPORE, MADRAS

Second Edition

xx-12-49

Printed by
C. SUBBARAYUDU
AT THE VASANTA PRESS
THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIET
ADYAR, MADRAS

Price : Rs. 3-8-0

PREFACE

Upadeshasâhasrî written by Srî Sankara, the great Teacher is translated into English with explanatory footnotes which will be found useful by readers while going through the book.

References to *Upanishats*, the *Vedânta Aphorisms* and the *Bhagavad-Gîtâ* mostly quoted by the author have been carefully traced and shown at the bottom of the pages, which, it is presumed, will throw much clear light on the Text and solve difficulties.

In his eagerness to do good to people the great author, while writing the book, has spared no pains in making clear the idea of the distinction between oneself and one's body, mind, etc., which, when rightly comprehended under the benevolent guidance of a Teacher, a man of Knowledge, will perfectly convince one that one is not other than the Unlimited Bliss untouched by hunger and thirst, grief and delusion, old age and death, the only real Existence, the Goal of all human beings to be realized in life.

Râmatîrtha's glossary on Sankara's *Upadeshasâhasrî* has been followed in translating the book and appending footnotes.

Certain words not to be found in the text but necessary for making the meaning clear have very often been

placed within brackets. Explanatory paragraphs have been added to the translation in a few places. In studying the book one may begin either with the prose part or the metrical. We have adopted the most acceptable readings after consulting the Nirnayasâgar, Lotus Library and Mysore editions of the book.

An index to the verses is appended at the end of the book. It will, it is hoped, be found useful.

Srinagar, Kashmir TRANSLATOR
July 24, 1941

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Ai. U.	Aitareyopanishat.
Bh. Gîta	Bhagavadgîtâ.
Br. Sû.	Brahma Sûtra (Vedânta Sûtras).
Br. U.	Brihadâranyakopanishat.
Chh. U.	Chhândogyopanishat.
G. K.	Gaudapâda's Mândûkya-Kârikâ.
Ish. U.	Ishopanishat.
Kath. U.	Kathopanishat.
Ke. U.	Kenopanishat.
Mâ. U.	Mândûkyopanishat.
M. N. U.	Mahânârâyanopanishat.
Mu. U.	Mundakopanishat.
Nâ. U.	Nârâyanopanishat.
Pra. U.	Prasnopanishat.
Sw. U.	Swetâswataropanishat.
T. A.	Taittiriya Âranyaka.
Tai. U.	Taittirîyopanishat.

CONTENTS

PART I (PROSE)

PART II (METRICAL)

उपदेशसाहस्री

A THOUSAND TEACHINGS

गद्यबन्धः प्रथमो भागः

Part I (Prose)

शिष्यप्रतिबोधविधिप्रकरणम् ॥ १ ॥

CHAPTER I

A METHOD OF ENLIGHTENING THE DISCIPLE

अथ मोक्षसाधनोपदेशविधिं व्याख्यास्यामो मुमुक्षूणां श्रद्दधानानामर्थिनामर्थाय ॥ १ ॥

1. We shall now[1] explain a method of teaching the means[2] to liberation for the benefit of those aspirants after liberation who are desirous (of this teaching) and are possessed of faith (in it).

[1] After writing various books.

[2] Self-Knowledge.

तदिदं मोक्षसाधनं ज्ञानं साधनसाध्यादनित्यात्सर्वस्माद्विरक्ताय त्यक्तपुत्रवित्तलोकैषणाय प्रतिपन्नपरमहंसपारिव्राज्याय शमदमदयादियुक्ताय शास्त्रप्रसिद्धशिष्यगुणसम्पन्नाय शुचये ब्राह्मणाय विधिवदुपसन्नाय शिष्याय जातिकर्मवृत्तविद्याभिजनैः परीक्षिताय ब्रूयात् पुनःपुनः यावद्ग्रहणं दृढीभवति ॥ २ ॥

2. That means to liberation, viz. Knowledge, should be explained again and again until it is firmly grasped, to a pure *Brâhmana* disciple who is indifferent to everything that is transitory and achievable through certain means, who has given up the desire for a son, for wealth and for this world[1] and the next,[2] who has adopted the life of a wandering monk and is endowed with control over the mind and senses, with compassion etc., as well as with the qualities of a disciple well-known in the scriptures, and who has approached the teacher in the prescribed manner, and been examined in respect of his caste, profession, conduct, learning and parentage.

श्रुतिश्च—'परीक्ष्य लोकान् . . . तत्त्वतो ब्रह्मविद्याम्' इति। दृढगृहीता हि विद्या आत्मनः श्रेयसे सन्तत्यै च भवति। विद्यासन्ततिश्च प्राण्यनुग्रहाय भवति नौरिव नदीं तितीर्षोः। शास्त्रं च—'यद्यप्यस्मा इमामद्भिः परिगृहीतां धनस्य पूर्णां दद्यात् एतदेव ततो भूयः' इति। अन्यथा च ज्ञानप्राप्त्यभावात्—'आचार्यवान् पुरुषो वेद', 'आचार्याद्धैव विद्या

[1] Attainable through the birth of a son. Br. U., 1. 5. 16 and Br. U., 6. 4. 1. Sankara's Commentary.

[2] The region of the fathers, the result of *Vedic* actions, and that of the gods, the result of meditation. Br. U., 1. 5. 16.

विदिता', 'आचार्यः प्लावयिता', 'सम्यग्ज्ञानं प्लव इहोच्यते' इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः, 'उपदेक्ष्यन्ति ते ज्ञानं' इत्यादिस्मृतेश्च ॥ ३ ॥

3. The *Sruti*[1] also says "A *Brâhmana* after examining those worlds which are the result of *Vedic* actions should be indifferent to them seeing that nothing eternal can be achieved by means of those actions. Then, with fuel in his hands he should approach a teacher versed in the *Vedas* and established in *Brahman*, in order to know the Eternal. The learned teacher should correctly explain to that disciple who has self-control and a tranquil mind, and has approached him in the prescribed manner, the knowledge of *Brahman* revealing the imperishable and eternal Being." For only when knowledge is firmly grasped, it conduces to one's own good and is capable of transmission. This transmission of knowledge is helpful to people, like a boat to one who wants to cross a river. The scriptures too say "Although one may give to the teacher this world surrounded by oceans and full of riches, this knowledge is even greater than that." Otherwise[2] there would be no attainment of knowledge. For the *Srutis* say, "A man[3] having a teacher can know *Brahman*," "Knowledge[4] received from a teacher alone (becomes perfect)," "The teacher is the pilot," "Right Knowledge is called in this world a raft," etc. The *Smriti*[5] also says, "knowledge will be imparted to you" etc.

[1] Mu. U., 1. 2. 12, 13.
[2] If it were not taught by a teacher.
[3] Chh. U., 6. 14. 2.
[4] Chh. U., 4. 9. 3.
[5] Bh. Gîtâ, 4. 34.

शिष्यस्य ज्ञानाग्रहणं च लिङ्गैर्बुद्ध्वा अग्रहणे हेतून् अधर्म-लौकिक-प्रमाद-नित्यानित्यविवेकविषयासंजातदृढपूर्वश्रुतत्व-लोक-चिन्तावेक्षण-जात्याद्यभिमानादीन् तत्प्रतिपक्षैः श्रुतिस्मृतिविहितैः अपनयेत्, अक्रोधादिभिरहिंसादिभिश्च यमैः, ज्ञानाविरुद्धैश्च नियमैः ॥ ४ ॥

4. When the teacher finds from signs that knowledge has not been grasped (or has been wrongly grasped) by the disciple he should remove the causes of non-comprehension which are past and present sins, laxity,[1] want of previous firm knowledge of what constitutes the subjects[2] of discrimination between the eternal and the non-eternal, courting popular esteem, vanity of caste etc., and so on, through means contrary to those causes, enjoined by the *Srutis* and *Smritis* viz. avoidance of anger etc., and the vows (*Yama*[3]) consisting of non-injury etc., also the rules of conduct that are not inconsistent with knowledge.

अमानित्वादिगुणं च ज्ञानोपायं सम्यक् ग्राहयेत् ॥ ५ ॥

5. He should also thoroughly impress upon the disciple qualities like humility, which are the means to knowledge.

आचार्यस्तूहापोहग्रहणधारणशमदमदयानुग्रहादिसम्पन्नो लब्धा-गमो दृष्टादृष्टभोगेष्वनासक्तः त्यक्तसर्वकर्मसाधनो ब्रह्मवित् ब्रह्मणि स्थितोऽभिन्नवृत्तो दम्भदर्पकुहकशाठ्यमायामात्सर्यानृताहङ्कारमम-

[1] Unrestrained conduct, speech, eating, etc. [2] viz., the Self and the non-Self. [3] i.e., non-injury, truthfulness, non-stealing, continence and non-acceptance of gifts.

त्वादिदोषवर्जितः केवलपरानुग्रहप्रयोजनो विद्योपयोगार्थी पूर्वमुपदिशेत्—'सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम्', 'यत्र नान्यत्पश्यति', 'आत्मैवेदं सर्वम्', 'आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीत्', 'सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म' इत्याद्याः आत्मैक्यप्रतिपादनपराः श्रुतीः ॥ ६ ॥

6. The teacher is one who is endowed with the power of furnishing arguments pro and con, of understanding questions [1] and remembering [2] them, who possesses tranquillity, self-control, compassion and a desire to help others, who is versed [3] in the scriptures and unattached to enjoyments both seen [4] and unseen, who has renounced the means to all kinds of actions, is a knower of *Brahman* and established in It, is never a transgressor of the rules of conduct, and who is devoid of shortcomings such as ostentation, pride, deceit, cunning, jugglery, jealousy, falsehood, egotism and attachment. He has the sole aim of helping others and a desire to impart the knowledge of *Brahman* only. He should first of all teach the *Sruti* texts establishing the oneness of the Self with *Brahman* such as, "My [5] child, in the beginning it (the universe) was Existence only, one alone without a second," "Where [6] one sees nothing else," "All [7] this is but the Self", "In [8] the beginning all this was but the one Self" and "All [9] this is verily *Brahman*".

[1] Put by the disciple. [2] So as to answer them. [3] Through instructions traditionally handed down to him. [4] i.e., both here and hereafter. [5] Chh. U., 6. 2. 1. [6] Chh. U., 7. 24. 1. [7] Chh. U., 7. 25. 2. [8] Ai. U., 1. 1. 1. [9] Chh. U., 3. 14. 1.

उपदिश्य च ग्राहयेत् ब्रह्मणो लक्षणम्—'य आत्माऽपहत-पाप्मा', 'यत्साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्म', 'योऽशनायापिपासे', 'नेति नेति', 'अस्थूलमनणु', 'स एष नेति', 'अदृष्टं द्रष्टृ', 'विज्ञानमानन्दम्', 'सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तम्', 'अदृश्येऽनात्म्ये', 'स वा एष महानज आत्मा', 'अप्राणो ह्यमनाः', 'सबाह्याभ्यन्तरो ह्यजः', 'विज्ञानघन एव', 'अनन्तरमबाह्यम्', 'अन्यदेव तद्विदितादथो अविदितात्', 'आकाशो वै नाम' इत्यादिश्रुतिभिः ॥ ७ ॥

स्मृतिभिश्च—'न जायते म्रियते वा', 'नादत्ते कस्यचित्पापम्', 'यथाकाशस्थितो नित्यम्', 'क्षेत्रज्ञं चापि मां विद्धि', 'न सत्तन्नासदुच्यते', 'अनादित्वान्निर्गुणत्वात्', 'समं सर्वेषु भूतेषु', 'उत्तमः पुरुषस्त्वन्यः' इत्यादिभिः श्रुत्युक्तलक्षणाविरुद्धाभिः परमात्मासंसारित्वप्रतिपादनपराभिः तस्य सर्वेणानन्यत्वप्रतिपादनपराभिश्च ॥ ८ ॥

7, 8. After teaching these he should teach the definition of *Brahman* through such *Sruti* texts as "The Self[1] devoid of sins", "The *Brahman*[2] that is immediate and direct," "That[3] which is beyond hunger and thirst", "Not[4]-this, not-this", "Neither[5] gross nor subtle", "This[6] Self is not-this", "It[7] is the Seer Itself unseen", "Knowledge[8]-Bliss", "Existence[9]-Knowledge-Infinite", "Imperceptible[10] bodiless", "That[11] great

[1] Chh. U., 8. 7. 1. [2] Br. U., 3. 4. 1. [3] Br. U., 3. 5. 1.
[4] Br. U., 2. 3. 6. [5] Br. U., 3. 8. 8. [6] Br. U., 3. 9. 26.
[7] Br. U., 3. 8. 11. [8] Br. U., *Sloka* 7, under 3. 9. 27.
[9] Tai. U., 2. 1. [10] Tai. U., 2. 7. [11] Br. U., 4. 4. 22.

unborn Self", "Without[1] the vital force and the mind," "Unborn[2], comprising the interior and exterior", "Consisting[3] of knowledge only", "Without[4] interior or exterior", "It[5] is verily beyond what is known as also what is unknown" and "Called[6] *Ākâsha* (the self-effulgent One)", and also through such *Smriti* texts as the following: "It is[7] neither born nor dies," "It is[8] not affected by anybody's sins," "Just[9] as air is always in the ether," "The individual[10] Self should be regarded as the universal one," "It is[11] called neither existent nor non-existent," "As[12] the Self is beginningless and devoid of qualities," "The[13] same in all beings" and "The Supreme[14] Being is different;"—all these support the definition given by the *Srutis* and prove that the innermost Self is beyond transmigratory existence and that it is not different from *Brahman*, the all-comprehensive principle.

एवं श्रुतिस्मृतिभिः गृहीतपरमात्मलक्षणं शिष्यं संसारसागरादुत्तितीर्षुं पृच्छेत्—कस्त्वमसि सोम्येति ॥ ९ ॥

9. The disciple who has thus learnt the definition of the inner Self from the *Srutis* and the *Smritis* and is eager to cross the ocean of transmigratory existence is asked, "who are you, my child?"

स यदि ब्रूयात्—ब्राह्मणपुत्रः अदोन्वयः ब्रह्मचार्यासम्, गृहस्थो वा, इदानीमस्मि परमहंसपरिव्राट् संसारसागरात् जन्ममृत्युमहाग्राहात् उत्तितीर्षुरिति ॥ १० ॥

[1] Mu. U., 2. 1. 2. [2] Mu. U., 2. 1. 2. [3] Br. U., 2. 4. 12.
[4] Br. U., 2. 5. 19. [5] Ke. U., 1. 3. [6] Chh. U., 8. 14. 1.
[7] Bh. Gîtâ, 2. 20. [8] Bh. Gîtâ, 5. 15. [9] Bh. Gîtâ, 9. 6.
[10] Bh. Gîtâ, 13, 2. [11] Bh. Gîtâ, 13. 12. [12] Bh. Gîtâ, 13. 31.
[13] Bh. Gîtâ, 13. 27. [14] Bh. Gîtâ, 15. 17.

आचार्यो ब्रूयात्—इहैव तव सोम्य मृतस्य शरीरं वयोभिरद्यते मृद्भावं वापद्यते, तत्र कथं संसारादुद्धर्तुमिच्छसीति । नहि नद्याः अवरे कूले भस्मीभूते नद्याः पारं तरिष्यसीति ॥ ११ ॥

10, 11. If he says, "I am the son of a *Brâhmana* belonging to such and such a lineage, I was a student or a householder, and am now a wandering monk anxious to cross the ocean of transmigratory existence infested with the terrible sharks of birth and death," the teacher should say, "My child, how do you desire to go beyond transmigratory existence as your body will be eaten up by birds or will turn into earth even here when you die ? For, burnt to ashes on this side of the river, you cannot cross to the other side."

स यदि ब्रूयात्—अन्योऽहं शरीरात् । शरीरं तु जायते म्रियते, वयोभिरद्यते, शस्त्राग्न्यादिभिश्च विनाश्यते, व्याध्यादिभिश्च प्रयुज्यते । तस्मिन् अहं स्वकृतधर्माधर्मवशात् पक्षी नीडमिव प्रविष्टः पुनःपुनः शरीरविनाशे धर्माधर्मवशात् शरीरान्तरं यास्यामि, पूर्वनीडविनाशे पक्षीव नीडान्तरम् । एवमेवाहमनादौ संसारे देवमनुष्यतिर्यङ्निरयस्थानेषु स्वकर्मवशादुपात्तमुपात्तं शरीरं त्यजन्, नवं नवं च अन्यदुपाददानो, जन्ममरणप्रबन्धचक्रे घटीयन्त्रवत् स्वकर्मणा भ्राम्यमाणः क्रमेणेदं शरीरमासाद्य संसारचक्रभ्रमणात् अस्मान्निर्विण्णो भगवन्तमुपसन्नोऽस्मि संसारचक्रभ्रमणप्रशमाय । तस्मान्नित्य एवाहं शरीरादन्यः । शरीराणि आगच्छन्त्यपगच्छन्ति च वासांसीव पुरुषस्येति ॥ १२ ॥

आचार्यो ब्रूयात्—साध्ववादीः, सम्यक्पश्यसि । कथं मृषाऽवादीः, ब्राह्मणपुत्रोऽदोन्वयो ब्रह्मचार्यासम् , गृहस्थो वा, इदानीमस्मि परमहंसपरिव्राडिति ॥ १३ ॥

12, 13. If he says, "I am different from the body. The body is born and dies, is eaten up by birds, is destroyed by weapons, fire etc., and suffers from diseases and the like. I have entered it, like a bird its nest, on account of merit and demerit accruing from acts done by myself, and like a bird going to another nest when the previous one is destroyed I shall enter into different bodies again and again as a result of merits and demerits when the present body is gone. Thus in this beginningless world on account of my own actions I have been giving up successive bodies assumed among gods, men, animals and the denizens of hell and assuming ever new ones. I have in this way been made to go round and round in the cycle of endless births and deaths, as in a Persian wheel by my past actions, and having in the course of time obtained the present body I have got tired of this going round and round in the wheel of transmigration, and have come to you, Sir, to put an end to this rotation. I am, therefore, always different from the body. It is bodies that come and go, like clothes on a person,"—the teacher would reply, "You have spoken well. You see aright. Why then did you wrongly say, 'I am the son of a *Brâhmana* belonging to such and such a lineage, I was a student or a householder and am now a wandering monk?'"

तं प्रति ब्रूयादाचार्यः—स यदि ब्रूयात् भगवन्, कथमहं मृषाऽवादिषमिति ॥ १४ ॥ यतस्त्वं भिन्नजात्यन्वयसंस्कारं शरीरं जात्यन्वयवर्जितस्यात्मनः प्रत्यभ्यज्ञासीः ब्राह्मणपुत्रोऽदोऽन्वय इत्यादिना वाक्येनेति ॥ १५ ॥

14, 15. If the disciple says, "How did I speak wrongly, Sir?" The teacher would reply, "Because by your statement, 'I am the son of a *Brâhmana* belonging to such and such a lineage etc.' you identified with the Self devoid of birth, lineage and purificatory ceremonies, the body possessed of them that are different[1] (from the Self)."

स यदि पृच्छेत् कथं भिन्नजात्यन्वयसंस्कारं शरीरं, कथं वा अहं जात्यन्वयसंस्कारवर्जित इति ॥ १६ ॥

आचार्यो ब्रूयात्—शृणु सोम्य यथेदं शरीरं त्वत्तो भिन्नं भिन्नजात्यन्वयसंस्कारं, त्वं च जात्यन्वयसंस्कारवर्जितः, इत्युक्त्वा तं स्मारयेत्—स्मर्तुमर्हसि सोम्य, परमात्मानं सर्वात्मानं यथोक्तलक्षणं श्रावितोऽसि 'सदेव सोम्येदम्' इत्यादिभिः श्रुतिभिः स्मृतिभिश्च । लक्षणं च तस्य श्रुतिभिः स्मृतिभिश्च ॥ १७ ॥

16, 17. If he asks, "How is the body possessed of the diversities of birth, lineage and purificatory ceremonies (different from the Self) and how am I devoid of them?"—The teacher would say, "Listen, my child, how this body is different from you and possessed of birth, lineage and sanctifying ceremonies and how you are free from these." Speaking thus he will remind the disciple saying, "You should remember, my child, you have been told about the innermost Self which is the Self of all with its characteristics as described by the *Srutis* such as 'This[2] was existence, my child' etc., as also the *Smritis*, and you should remember these characteristics also."

[1] i.e., of the nature of the non-Self.

[2] Chh. U., 6. 2. 1.

लब्धपरमात्मलक्षणस्मृतये ब्रूयात् —योऽसावाकाशनामा नामरूपाभ्यामर्थान्तरभूतः अशरीरः अस्थूलादिलक्षणः अपहतपाप्मादिलक्षणश्च सर्वैः संसारधर्मैः अनागन्धितः 'यत्साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्म', 'य आत्मा सर्वान्तरः', 'अदृष्टो द्रष्टा अश्रुतः श्रोता अमतो मन्ता अविज्ञातो विज्ञाता' नित्यविज्ञानस्वरूपः, अनन्तरः अबाह्यः विज्ञानघन एव, परिपूर्णः आकाशवत्, अनन्तशक्तिः, आत्मा सर्वस्य, अशनायादिवर्जितः, आविर्भावतिरोभाववर्जितश्च, स्वात्मविलक्षणयोः नामरूपयोः जगद्बीजभूतयोः स्वात्मस्थयोः तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीययोः स्वयंवेद्ययोः सद्भावमात्रेणाचिन्त्यशक्तित्वाद् व्याकर्ता अव्याकृतयोः ॥ १८ ॥

18. The teacher should say to the disciple who has remembered the definition of the Self, "That which is called *Âkâsha* (the self-effulgent one) which is distinct from name and form, bodiless and defined as not gross etc., and as free from sins and so on, which is untouched by all transmigratory conditions, 'The *Brahman* [1] that is immediate and direct,' 'The innermost [2] Self,' 'The unseen [3] seer, the unheard listener, the unthought thinker, the unknown knower', which is of the nature of eternal knowledge, without interior or exterior, consisting only of knowledge, all-pervading like the ether and of infinite power—that Self of all devoid of hunger etc., as also appearance and disappearance, is, by virtue of Its inscrutable power, the cause of the manifestation of unmanifested name and form which abide in the Self through Its very presence,[4] but are different from

[1] Br. U., 3. 4. 1. [2] Br. U., 3. 4. 1. [3] Br. U., 3. 7. 23.
[4] They have no existence of their own apart from that of the Self.

It, which are the seed of the universe, are describable neither as identical with It nor different from It, and are cognized by It alone.

ते नामरूपे अव्याकृते सती व्याक्रियमाणे तस्मादेतस्मादात्मन आकाशनामाकृती संवृत्ते । तच्चाकाशाख्यं भूतमनेन प्रकारेण परमात्मनः सम्भूतं प्रसन्नादिव सलिलान्मलमिव फेनम् । न सलिलं न च सलिलादत्यन्तभिन्नं फेनम् । सलिलव्यतिरेकेणादर्शनात् । सलिलं तु स्वच्छं अन्यत् फेनान्मलरूपात् । एवं परमात्मा नामरूपाभ्यामन्यः फेनस्थानीयाभ्यां शुद्धः प्रसन्नः तद्विलक्षणः । ते नामरूपे अव्याकृते सती व्याक्रियमाणे फेनस्थानीये आकाशनामाकृती संवृत्ते ॥ १९ ॥

19. "That name and form originally unmanifested took the name and form of the ether as they were manifested from that Self. This element called the ether thus arose out of the supreme Self, like the dirt called foam coming out of transparent water. Foam is neither water nor absolutely different from it. For it is never seen apart from water. But water is clear, and different from the foam which is of the nature of dirt. Similarly the supreme Self which is pure and transparent is different from name and form, which stand for foam. These—corresponding to the foam—having originally been unmanifested, took the name and form of the ether as they were manifested.

ततोऽपि स्थूलभावमापद्यमाने नामरूपे व्याक्रियमाणे वायुभावमापद्येते, ततोऽप्यग्निभावं, अग्नेरब्भावं, ततः पृथ्वीभावं इत्येवंक्रमेण पूर्वपूर्वानुप्रवेशेन पञ्चमहाभूतानि पृथिव्यन्तान्युत्प-

ञ्जानि । ततः पञ्चमहाभूतगुणविशिष्टा पृथ्वी । पृथिव्याश्च पञ्चात्मिकयो व्रीहियवाद्या ओषधयो जायन्ते । ताभ्यो भक्षिताभ्यो लोहितं च शुक्रं च स्त्रीपुंसशरीरसंबन्धि जायते । तदुभयमृतुकाले अविद्याप्रयुक्तकामखजनिर्मथनोद्धृतं मन्त्रसंस्कृतं गर्भाशये निषिच्यते । तत्स्वयोनिरसानुप्रवेशेन विवर्धमानं गर्भीभूतं नवमे दशमे वा मासि सञ्जायते ॥ २० ॥

20. "Name and form, as they became still grosser in the course of manifestation assumed the form of air. From that again they became fire, from that water, and thence earth. In this order the preceding elements penetrated the succeeding ones, and the five gross elements ending with earth came into existence. Earth, therefore, possesses the qualities of all the five gross elements. From earth compounded of all the five great elements, herbs such as paddy and barley are produced. From these, after they are eaten, are formed blood and the seed of women and men respectively. These two ingredients drawn out, as by a churning rod, by lust springing from Ignorance, and sanctified by *mantras*,[1] are placed in the womb at the proper time. Through the infiltration of the sustaining fluids[2] of the mother's body, it[3] develops into an embryo and is delivered at the ninth or tenth month.

तज्जातं लब्धनामाकृतिकं जातकर्मादिभिः मन्त्रसंस्कृतं पुनः उपनयनसंस्कारयोगेन ब्रह्मचारिसंज्ञं भवति । तदेव शरीरं पत्नी-

[1] sacred mystical formulae.
[2] derived from food.
[3] blood and seed mixed together.

योगसंस्कारयोगेन गृहस्थसंज्ञं भवति । तदेव वनस्थसंस्कारेण तापससंज्ञं भवति । तदेव क्रियाविनिवृत्तिनिमित्तसंस्कारेण परिव्राट्संज्ञं भवति । इत्येवं त्वत्तो भिन्नं भिन्नजात्यन्वयसंस्कारं शरीरम् ॥ २१ ॥

21. "It is born, or is possessed of a form and a name and is purified by means of *mantras* relating to natal and other ceremonies. Sanctified again by the ceremony of investiture with the holy thread, it gets the appellation of a student. The same body is designated a house-holder when it undergoes the sacrament of being joined to a wife. That again is called a recluse when it undergoes the ceremonies pertaining to retirement into the forest. And it becomes known as a wandering monk when it performs the ceremonies leading to the renunciation of all activities. Thus [1] the body which has birth, lineage and purificatory ceremonies different (from the Self) is different from you.

मनश्चेन्द्रियाणि च नामरूपात्मकान्येव 'अन्नमयं हि सोम्य मनः' इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः ॥ २२ ॥

22. "That the mind and the senses are also of the nature of name and form is known from the *Sruti*, 'The mind, my child, consists of food [2].'

कथं चाहं भिन्नजात्यन्वयसंस्कारवर्जित इत्येतच्छृणु । योऽसौ नामरूपयोर्व्याकर्ता नामरूपधर्मविलक्षणः स एव नामरूपे व्या-

[1] See paras 15 and 16 above.
[2] Food is transformed into the substance of the mind and invigorates it. Chh. U., 6. 5. 4 and 6. 5. 6.

कुर्वन् सृष्ट्वेदं शरीरं स्वयं संस्कारधर्मवर्जितो नामरूपे इह प्रविष्टः अन्यैरदृष्टः स्वयं पश्यन्, तथाऽश्रुतः शृण्वन्, अमतो मन्वानो, अविज्ञातो विजानन्—'सर्वाणि रूपाणि विचित्य धीरो नामानि कृत्वाऽभिवदन् यदास्ते' इति। अस्मिन्नर्थे श्रुतयः सहस्रशः 'तत्सृष्ट्वा तदेवानुप्राविशत्', 'अन्तः प्रविष्टः शास्ता जनानाम्', 'स एष इह प्रविष्टः', 'एष त आत्मा', 'स एतमेव सीमानं विदार्यैतया द्वारा प्रापद्यत', 'एष सर्वेषु भूतेषु गूढोत्मा', 'सेयं देवतैक्षत हन्ताहमिमास्तिस्रो देवताः' इत्याद्याः ॥ २३ ॥

23. "You said, 'How am I devoid of birth, lineage and sanctifying ceremonies which are different (from the Self ?)' Listen. The same one who is the cause of the unfoldment of name and form, whose nature is different from that of name and form, and who is devoid of all connection with sanctifying ceremonies, evolved name and form, created this body and entered into it (which is but name and form)—who is Himself the unseen seer, the unheard listener, the unthought thinker, the unknown knower as stated in the *Sruti* text, '(I [1] know) who creates names and forms and remains speaking'. There are thousands of *Sruti* texts conveying the same meaning ; for instance, 'He [2] created and entered into it,' 'Entering [3] into them He rules all creatures,' 'He,[4] the Self, has entered into these bodies,' 'This [5] is your Self,' 'Opening [6] this very suture of the Skull He got in by that door,' 'This [7] Self is concealed in all beings,' 'That [8] Divinity thought—let me enter into these three deities.'

[1] T. Â., 3. 12. 7.
[2] Tai. U., 2. 6.
[3] T. Â., 3. 11. 1, 2.
[4] Br. U., 1. 4. 7.
[5] Br. U., 3. 4. 1.
[6] Ai. U., 1. 3. 12.
[7] Kath. U., 3. 12.
[8] Chh. U., 6. 3. 2.

स्मृतयोऽपि 'आत्मैव देवताः सर्वाः', 'नवद्वारे पुरे देही', क्षेत्रज्ञं चापि मां विद्धि', 'समः सर्वेषु भूतेषु', 'उपद्रष्टानुमन्ता च', 'उत्तमः पुरुषस्त्वन्यः', 'अशरीरं शरीरेषु' इत्याद्याः। तस्मात् जात्यन्वयसंस्कारवर्जितस्त्वमिति सिद्धम् ॥ २४ ॥

24. "*Smriti* texts too elucidate the same truth; for example, 'All [1] gods verily are the Self,' 'The Self [2] in the city of nine gates,' 'Know [3] the individual Self to be Myself', 'The same [4] in all beings,' 'The witness [5] and approver,' 'The Supreme [6] Being is different,' 'Residing in [7] all bodies but Itself devoid of any,' and so on. Therefore it is established that you are without any connection with birth, lineage and sanctifying ceremonies."

स यदि ब्रूयात्—अन्य एवाहमज्ञः सुखी दुःखी बद्धः संसारी, अन्योऽसौ मद्विलक्षणः असंसारी देवः, तमहं बल्युपहारनमस्कारादिभिः वर्णाश्रमकर्मभिश्चाराध्य संसारसागरादुत्तितीर्षुरस्मि, कथमहं स एवेति ॥ २५ ॥

25. If he says, "I am in bondage, liable to transmigration, ignorant, (sometimes) happy, (sometimes) unhappy and am entirely different from Him. He, the shining One who is dissimilar in nature to me and beyond transmigratory existence is also different from me. I want to worship Him through the actions pertaining to my caste and order of life by making presents and offerings to Him and also by making

[1] Manu, XII. 119. [2] Bh. Gîtâ, 5. 13. [3] Bh. Gîtâ, 13. 2.
[4] Bh. Gîtâ, 13. 27. [5] Bh. Gîtâ. 13. 22. [6] Bh. Gîtâ, 15. 17.
[7] Kath. U., 2. 22, but the *Smriti* source untraced.

salutations and the like. I am eager to cross the ocean of the world in this way. So how am I He Himself ?"

आचार्यो ब्रूयात्—नैवं सोम्य प्रतिपत्तुमर्हसि, प्रतिषिद्धत्वाद्भेदप्रतिपत्तेः । कथं प्रतिषिद्धा भेदप्रतिपत्तिरित्यत आह—'अन्योऽसावन्योऽहमस्मीति न स वेद', 'ब्रह्म तं परादाद्योऽन्यत्रात्मनो ब्रह्म वेद', 'मृत्योः स मृत्युमाप्नोति य इह नानेव पश्यति' इत्येवमाद्याः ॥ २६ ॥

26. The teacher should say, "You ought not, my child, regard it so ; because a doctrine of difference is forbidden." In reply to the question, 'Why is it forbidden ?' the following other *Sruti* texts may be cited : "He [1] who knows that *Brahman* is one and he is another does not know *(Brahman)*", "He [2] who regards the *Brâhmanical* caste as different from himself is rejected [3] by that caste." "One [4] who views *Brahman* as if having diversity in It goes from death to death", and so on.

एता एव श्रुतयो भेदप्रतिपत्तेः संसारगमनं दर्शयन्ति ॥ २७ ॥

27. These *Srutis* show that transmigratory existence is the sure result of the acceptance of (the reality of) difference.

अभेदप्रतिपत्तेश्च मोक्षं दर्शयन्ति सहस्रशः—'स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि' इति परमात्मभावं विधाय 'आचार्यवान् पुरुषो वेद' इत्युक्त्वा 'तस्य तावदेव चिरम्' इति मोक्षं दर्शयन्त्यभेदविज्ञा-

[1] Br. U., 1. 4. 10. [2] Br. U., 2. 4. 6. [3] Makes him disinclined to know *Brahman*.
[4] Br. U., 4. 4. 19.

2

नादेव । सत्याभिसन्धस्य अतस्करस्येव दाहाद्यभाववत् संसाराभावं दर्शयन्ति दृष्टान्तेन, भेददर्शनादसत्याभिसन्धस्य संसारगमनं दर्शयन्ति तस्करस्येव दाहादिदृष्टान्तेन ॥ २८ ॥

28. "That, on the other hand, liberation results from the acceptance of (the reality of) non-difference is borne out by thousands of *Srutis*; for example, after teaching that the individual Self is not different from the supreme One in the text, "That[1] is the Self, thou art That', and after saying, 'A[2] man who has a teacher knows *Brahman*' the *Srutis* prove liberation to be the result of the knowledge of (the reality of) non-difference only, by saying 'A[3] knower of *Brahman* has to wait only so long as he is not merged in *Brahman*'. That transmigratory existence comes to an absolute cessation, (in the case of one who speaks the truth that difference has no real existence), is illustrated by the example of one[4] who was not a thief and did not get burnt (by grasping a heated hatchet;) and that one, speaking what is not true (i.e. the reality of difference), continues to be in the mundane condition is illustrated by the example of a thief who got burnt.

'त इह व्याघ्रो वा' इत्यादिना च अभेददर्शनात् 'स स्वराट् भवति' इत्युक्त्वा तद्विपरीतेन भेददर्शनेन संसारगमनं दर्शयन्ति—'अथ येऽन्यथाऽतो विदुरन्यराजानस्ते क्षय्यलोका भवन्ति' इति प्रतिशाखम् । तस्मात् मृषैवैवमवादीः—ब्राह्मणपुत्रोऽद्रोऽन्वयः संसारी परमात्मविलक्षण इति ॥ २९ ॥

[1] Chh. U., 6. 13. 3.
[2] Chh. U., 6. 14. 2.
[3] Chh. U., 6. 14. 2.
[4] Chh. U., 6. 16. 1—3.

29. "The *Sruti* text commencing with 'Whatever[1] these creatures are here, whether a tiger or' and similar other texts, after asserting that 'One[2] becomes one's own master (i.e. *Brahman*)' by the knowledge of (the reality of) non-difference, show that one continues to remain in the transmigratory condition in the opposite case as the result of the acceptance of (the reality of) difference, saying, 'Knowing[3] differently from this they get other beings for their masters and reside in perishable regions'. Such statements are found in every branch of the *Veda*. It was, therefore, certainly wrong on your part to say that you were the son of a *Brâhmana*, that you belonged to such and such a lineage, that you were subject to transmigration and that you were different from the supreme Self.

तस्मात् प्रतिषिद्धत्वाद्भेददर्शनस्य, भेदविषयत्वाच्च कर्मोपादानस्य, कर्मसाधनत्वाच्च यज्ञोपवीतादे: कर्मसाधनोपादानस्य परमात्माभेदप्रतिपत्त्या प्रतिषेध: कृतो वेदितव्य: । कर्मणां तत्साधनानां च यज्ञोपवीतादीनां परमात्माभेदप्रतिपत्तिविरुद्धत्वात् । संसारिणो हि कर्माणि विधीयन्ते तत्साधनानि च यज्ञोपवीतादीनि, न परमात्मनोऽभेददर्शिन: । भेददर्शनमात्रेण च ततोऽन्यत्वम् ॥ ३० ॥

30. "As the acceptance of (the reality of) difference s forbidden, it should be understood that, on the knowledge of one's identity with the supreme Self, the undertaking of religious rites which have difference for their

[1] Chh. U., 6. 9. 3. [2] Chh. U., 6. 25. 2. [3] Chh. U., 7. 25. 2.

province and the assumption of *yajnopavîta*[1] etc., which are the means to their performance, are forbidden. For these rites and *yajnopavîta* etc., their means, are inconsistent with the knowledge of one's identity with the supreme Self. It is on those people only that refer classes and orders of life etc., to the Self that Vedic actions and *yajnopavîta* etc., their means, are enjoined, but not on those who have acquired the knowledge of their identity with the supreme Self. That[2] one is other than *Brahman* is due only to the acceptance of (the reality of) difference.

यदि कर्माणि कर्तव्यानि, न निवर्तयिषितानि, कर्मसाधनासम्बन्धिनः कर्मनिमित्तजात्याश्रमाद्यसम्बन्धिनश्च परमात्मनश्च आत्मनैवाभेदप्रतिपत्तिं नावक्ष्यत् 'स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि' इत्येवमादिभिर्निश्चितरूपैर्वाक्यैः, भेदप्रतिपत्तिनिन्दां च नाभ्यधास्यत् 'एष नित्यो महिमा ब्राह्मणस्य', 'अनन्वागतं पुण्येनानन्वागतं पापेन, अत्र स्तेनोऽस्तेनः' इत्यादिना ॥ ३१ ॥

31. "If *Vedic* rites were to be performed and not meant to be renounced, the *Sruti* would neither have declared the identity of oneself with the supreme Self unrelated to those rites, their means, castes, orders of life, etc., which are the conditions[3] of *Vedic* actions, in unambiguous sentences like 'That[4] is the Self, thou art

[1] The holy thread worn by the first three classes of the Hindus—the *Brâhmanas*, the *Kshatriyas*, and the *Vaishyas*.

[2] This is said in reply to the objection viz., why are duties enjoined only on the ignorant as they are also not different from *Brahman*?

[3] Those only who belong to castes or orders of life are fit for *Vedic* actions.

[4] Chh. U., 6. 8. 7.

That ; ' nor would it have condemned the acceptance of (the reality of) difference in clauses such as ' It[1] is the eternal glory of the knower of *Brahman*.' ' Untouched[2] by virtue, untouched by sin ', and ' Here[3] a thief is no thief.'

कर्मसम्बन्धिस्वरूपत्वं कर्मनिमित्तवर्णाद्यसम्बन्धरूपतां च नाभ्यधास्यत्, कर्माणि च कर्मसाधनानि च यज्ञोपवीतादीनि यद्यपरित्याज्यिषितानि । तस्मात् ससाधनं कर्म परित्यक्तव्यं मुमुक्षुणा, परमात्माऽभेददर्शनविरोधात्, आत्मा च पर एवेति प्रतिपत्तव्यो यथाश्रुत्युक्तलक्षणः ॥ ३२ ॥

32. "The *Srutis* would not have stated that the essential nature of the Self was in no way connected with *Vedic* rites and conditions required by them such as a particular class, and the rest, if they did not intend that those rites and *yajnopavîta* etc., their means, should be given up. Therefore, *Vedic* actions which are incompatible with the knowledge of the identity of oneself with the supreme Self should be renounced together with their means by one who aspires after liberation ; and it should be known that the Self is no other than *Brahman* as defined in the *Srutis.*"

स यदि ब्रूयात्—भगवन्, दह्यमाने छिद्यमाने वा देहे प्रत्यक्षा वेदना, अशनायादिनिमित्तं च प्रत्यक्षं दुःखं मम । परश्चायमात्मा, ' अयमात्माऽपहतपाप्मा विजरो विमृत्युर्विशोको विजिघत्सोऽपिपासः सर्वगन्धरसवर्जितः ' इति श्रूयते सर्वश्रुतिषु स्मृतिषु च ।

[1] Br. U., 4. 4. 23. [2] Br. U., 4. 3. 22. [3] Br. U., 4. 3. 22.

कथं तद्विलक्षणः अनेकसंसारधर्मसंयुक्तः परमात्मानमात्मत्वेन च मां संसारिणं परमात्मत्वेन अग्निमिव शीतत्वेन प्रतिपद्येयम्? संसारी च सन् सर्वाभ्युदयनिःश्रेयससाधने अधिकृतः अभ्युदयनिःश्रेयससाधनानि कर्माणि तत्साधनानि च यज्ञोपवीतादीनि कथं परित्यजेयमिति ॥ ३३ ॥

33. If he says, "The pain due to burns or cuts in the body and the misery caused by hunger and the like, Sir, are distinctly perceived to be in me. The supreme Self is known in all the *Srutis* and the *Smritis* to be 'free[1] from sin, old age, death, grief, hunger, thirst, etc., and devoid of smell and taste'. How can I who am different from Him and possess so many phenomenal attributes possibly accept the supreme Self as myself and myself, a transmigratory being, as the supreme Self? I may them very well admit that fire is cool! Why should I, a man of the world entitled to accomplish all prosperity in this world and in the next and realize the supreme end of life, i.e., liberation, give up the actions producing those results and *yajnopavīta* etc., their accessories?"

तं प्रति ब्रूयात्—यदवोचो दह्यमाने छिद्यमाने वा देहे प्रत्यक्षा वेदनोपलभ्यते ममेति तदसत्। कस्मात्? दह्यमाने छिद्यमान इव वृक्षे उपलब्धुरुपलभ्यमाने कर्मणि शरीरे दाहच्छेदवेदनाया उपलभ्यमानत्वात् दाहादिसमानाश्रयैव वेदना। यत्र हि दाहः छेदो वा क्रियते तत्रैव व्यपदिशति दाहादिवेदनां लोकः, न वेदनां दाहाद्युपलब्धरीति। कथं? क्व ते वेदनेति पृष्टः शिरसि

[1] Chh. U., 8. 7. 1.

मे वेदना उरसि उदरे इति वा यत्र दाहादिस्तत्रैव व्यपदिशति, न तूपलब्धरीति। यद्युपलब्धरि वेदना स्यात्, वेदनानिमित्तं वा दाहच्छेदादि, वेदनाश्रयत्वेनोपदिशेद्दाहाद्याश्रयवत्॥ ३४॥

34. The teacher should say to him, "It was not right for you to say, 'I directly perceive the pain in me when my body gets cuts or burns'. Why? Because the pain due to cuts or burns, perceived in the body,[1] the object of the perception of the perceiver like a tree burnt or cut, must have the same location as the burns etc. People point out pain caused by burns and the like to be in that place where they occur but not in the perceiver. How? For, on being asked where one's pain lies, one says, 'I have pain in the head, in the chest or in the stomach'. Thus one points out pain in that place where burns or cuts occur, but never in the perceiver. If pain or its causes viz., burns or cuts were in the perceiver one would have pointed out the perceiver to be the seat of the pain, like the parts of the body, the seats of the burns or cuts.

स्वयं च नोपलभ्येत चक्षुर्गतरूपवत्। तस्मात् दाहच्छेदादिसमानाश्रयत्वेन उपलभ्यमानत्वाद्दाहादिवत् कर्मभूतैव वेदना। भावरूपत्वाच्च साश्रया तण्डुलपाकवत्। वेदनासमानाश्रय एव तत्संस्कारः। स्मृतिसमानकाल एवोपलभ्यमानत्वात् वेदनाविषयः। तन्निमित्तविषयश्च द्वेषोऽपि संस्कारसमानाश्रय एव।

[1] Pain is located in the body, it is true, but as a matter of fact it is in the mind.

तथा चोक्तम्—'रूपसंस्कारतुल्याऽऽधी रागद्वेषौ भयं च यत्।
गृह्यते धीश्रयं तस्माज्ज्ञाता शुद्धोऽभयः सदा' ॥ ३५ ॥

35. "Moreover, (if it were in the Self) the pain could not be perceived by the Self like the colour of the eye by the same eye. Therefore, as it is perceived to have the same seat as burns, cuts and the like, pain must be an object of perception like them. Since[1] it is an effect, it must have a receptacle like that in which rice is cooked. The impressions[2] of pain must have the same seat as pain[3] itself. As they are perceived during the time when memory is possible (i.e., in waking and dream, and not in deep sleep), these impressions must have the same location[4] as pain. The aversion to cuts, burns and the like, the causes of pain, must also have the same seat[5] as the impressions (of pain). It is therefore said, 'Desire[6], aversion and fear have a seat common with that of the impressions of colours. As they have for their seat the intellect,[7] the knower, the Self, is always pure and devoid of fear.'

किमाश्रयाः पुना रूपादिसंस्कारादय इति। उच्यते। यत्र कामादयः। क पुनस्ते कामादयः? 'कामः सङ्कल्पो विचि-

[1] This sentence is an answer to the objection that pain cannot be in the body which is non-conscious ; nor can it be in the Self which has been shown to be free from it ; so pain has no location at all.
[2] This is in reply to the objection viz, 'Let the Self be the receptacle as the impressions and memory etc. of pain are perceived in the Self.'
[3] Pain being proved to be not in the Self, its impressions also cannot be there. [4] And therefore it is not the Self. [5] i.e., the non-Self. [6] Verse 13, chapter 15 of this book. [7] The intellect (and not the Self) is the seat of all other feelings also.

कित्सा' इत्यादिश्रुतेः बुद्धावेव । तत्रैव रूपादिसंस्कारादयोऽपि, 'कस्मिन्नु रूपाणि प्रतिष्ठितानीति हृदये' इति श्रुतेः । 'कामा येऽस्य हृदि श्रिताः', 'तीर्णो हि तदा सर्वान् शोकान् हृदयस्य', 'असङ्गो ह्ययम्', 'तद्वा अस्यैतदतिच्छन्दाः' इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः, 'अविकार्योऽयमुच्यते', 'असादित्वान्निर्गुणत्वात्' इत्यादि इच्छाद्वेषादि च क्षेत्रस्यैव विषयस्य धर्मो नात्मन इति स्मृतिभ्यश्च कर्मस्थैवाशुद्धिः नात्मस्था इति ॥ ३६ ॥

36. " 'What is then the locus of the impressions of colours and the rest?' 'The same as that of lust etc.' 'Where again are lust etc.?' They are in the intellect (and no where else) according to the *Sruti*,[1] 'lust, deliberation, doubt.' The impressions of colours and so forth are also there (and nowhere else) according to the *Sruti*, 'what[2] is the seat of colours? The intellect.' That desire, aversion and the like are the attributes of the embodiment, the object and not of the Self, is known from the *Srutis*, 'Desires[3] that are in the intellect,' 'For[4] he is then beyond all the woes of his heart (intellect)', 'Because[5] It is unattached,' and 'Its[6] form untouched by desires' and also from *Smritis* such as 'It[7] is said to be changeless,' 'Because[8] It is beginningless and without attributes' and so on. Therefore (it is concluded that) inpurity pertains to the object and not to the Self.

अतो रूपादिसंस्काराद्यशुद्धिसंबन्धाभावात् न परस्मादात्मनो विलक्षणस्त्वमिति प्रत्यक्षादिविरोधाभावात् युक्तं पर एवात्माऽह-

[1] Br. U., 1. 5. 3. [2] Br. U., 3. 9. 20. [3] Br. U., 4. 4. 7.
[4] Br. U., 4. 3. 22. [5] Br. U., 4. 3. 16. [6] Br. U., 4. 3. 21.
[7] Bh. Gîtâ, 2. 25. [8] Bh. Gîtâ, 13. 31.

मिति प्रतिपत्तुम्—'तदात्मानमेवावेदहं ब्रह्मास्मि', 'एकधैवानुद्रष्टव्यम्', 'अहमेवाऽधस्तात्', 'आत्मैवाऽधस्तात्', 'सर्वमात्मानं पश्यति', 'यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैव', 'इदं सर्वं यदयमात्मा', 'स एषोऽकलः', 'अनन्तरमबाह्यम्', 'सबाह्याभ्यन्तरो ह्यजः', 'ब्रह्मैवेदम्', 'एतया द्वारा प्रापद्यत', 'प्रज्ञानस्य नामधेयानि', 'सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म', 'तस्माद्वा', 'तत्सृष्ट्वा तदेवानुप्राविशत्', 'एको देवः सर्वभूतेषु गूढः सर्वव्यापी', 'अशरीरं शरीरेषु', 'न जायते म्रियते', 'स्वप्नान्तं जागरितान्तम्', 'स म आत्मेति विद्यात्', 'यस्तु सर्वाणि भूतानि', 'तदेजति तन्नैजति', 'वेनस्तत्पश्यन्', 'तदेवाग्निः', 'अहं मनुरभवं सूर्यश्च', 'अन्तः प्रविष्टः शास्ता जनानाम्', 'सदेव सोम्य', 'तत्सत्यं स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि' इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः ॥३७॥

स्मृतिभ्यश्च—'पूः प्राणिनः सर्वगुहाशयस्य', 'आत्मैव देवताः', 'नवद्वारे पुरे', 'समं सर्वेषु भूतेषु', 'विद्याविनयसंपन्ने', 'अविभक्तं विभक्तेषु', 'वासुदेवः सर्वम्' इत्यादिभ्यः एक एवात्मा परं ब्रह्म सर्वसंसारधर्मविनिर्मुक्तस्त्वमिति सिद्धम् ॥३८॥

37, 38. "Therefore you are not different from the supreme Self inasmuch as you are devoid of impurities such as the connection with the impressions of colours and the like. As there is no contradiction to perceptional evidence etc. the supreme Self should be accepted as oneself according to the *Srutis*, 'It[1] knew the pure Self to be *Brahman*,' 'It[2] should be regarded as homogeneous,' 'It[3] is I that am below,' 'It[4] is the Self that is below,' 'He[5] knows everything to be the Self,' 'When[6]

[1] Br. U., 1. 4. 10. [2] Br. U., 4. 4. 20 [3] Chh. U., 7. 25. 1.
[4] Chh. U., 7. 25. 2. [5] Br. U., 4. 4. 23. [6] Br. U., 2. 4. 14.

everything becomes the Self,' 'All[1] this verily is the Self,' 'He[2] is without parts,' 'Without[3] the interior and exterior,' 'Unborn,[4] comprising the interior and exterior,' 'All[5] this verily is *Brahman*,' 'It[6] entered through this door,' 'The[7] names of pure knowledge,' 'Existence,[8] Knowledge, Infinite Brahman,' 'From[9] It,' 'It[10] created and entered it,' 'The[11] shining One without a second, concealed in all beings and all-pervading,' 'In[12] all bodies Itself bodiless,' 'It[13] is not born and does not die,' '(Knowing,) dream[14] and waking,' 'He[15] is my Self, thus one should know,' 'Who[16] (knows) all beings,' 'It[17] moves and moves not,' 'knowing[18] It, one becomes worthy of being worshipped,' 'It[19] and nothing but It is fire,' 'I[20] became *Manu* and the sun,' 'Entering[21] into them He rules all creatures,' 'Existence[22] only, my child' and 'That[23] is real, That is the Self, thou art That.'

"It is established that you, the Self, are the supreme *Brahman*, the One only and devoid of every phenomenal attribute from the *Smritis* also such as, 'All[24] beings are the body of One who resides in the hearts of all,' 'Gods[25] are verily the Self,' 'In[26] the city of nine gates,' 'The[27] same in all beings,' 'In[28] a *Brâhmana*

[1] Br. U., 2. 4. 6.
[2] Pra. U., 6. 5.
[3] Br. U., 2. 5. 19.
[4] Mu. U., 2. 1. 2.
[5] Mu. U., 2. 2. 11.
[6] Ai. U., 1, 3. 12.
[7] Ai. U., 3. 1. 2.
[8] Tai. U., 2. 1. 1.
[9] Tai. U., 2. 1, 1.
[10] Tai., U., 2. 1. 6
[11] Sw. U., 6. 11.
[12] Kath. U., 2. 22.
[13] Kath. U., 2. 18.
[14] Kath. U., 2. 1. 4.
[15] Kaushîtak. U., III. 8.
[16] Îsh. U., 6.
[17] Îsh. U., 5.
[18] M. N. U., 2. 3.
[19] T. Â., 10. 1.
[20] Br. U., 1. 4. 10.
[21] T. Â., 3. 11. 1. 2.
[22] Chh. U., 6. 2. 1.
[23] Chh. U., 6. 8. 7.
[24] Âpastamba Dharma Sûtra 1. 8. 22.
[25] Manu, XII. 119.
[26] Bh. Gîtâ, 5. 13.
[27] Bh. Gîtâ, 13. 27.
[28] Bh. Gîtâ, 5. 18.

wise and courteous', 'Undivided[1] in things divided' and 'All[2] this verily is *Vâsudeva* (the Self).'"

स यदि ब्रूयात्—यदि भगवन् 'अनन्तरोऽबाह्यः', 'सबाह्याभ्यन्तरो ह्यजः', 'कृत्स्नः', 'प्रज्ञानघन एव' सैन्धवघनवदात्मा सर्वमूर्तिभेदवर्जितः आकाशवदेकरसः, तर्हि किमिदं दृश्यते श्रूयते वा साध्यं साधनं वा साधकश्चेति श्रुतिस्मृतिलोकप्रसिद्धं वादिशतविप्रतिपत्तिविषय इति ॥ ३९ ॥

39. If he says "If, Sir, the Self is 'Without[3] interior or exterior,' 'Comprising[4] the interior and exterior, unborn,' 'Whole,' 'Pure consciousness only' like a lump of salt, devoid of all the various forms, and of a homogeneous nature like the ether, what is it that is observed in ordinary usage and revealed in *Srutis* and *Smritis* as what is to be accomplished, its (appropriate) means and its accomplishers, and is made the subject-matter of contention among hundreds of rival disputants holding different views?"

आचार्यो ब्रूयात्—अविद्याकृतमेतद्यदिदं दृश्यते श्रूयते वा, परमार्थतस्त्वेक एवात्मा अविद्यादृष्टेः अनेकवत् आभासते, तिमिरदृष्ट्या अनेकचन्द्रवत् । 'यत्र वा अन्यदिव स्यात्', 'यत्र हि द्वैतमिव भवति तदितर इतरं पश्यति', 'मृत्योः स मृत्युमाप्नोति', 'अथ यत्रान्यत्पश्यति अन्यच्छृणोति अन्यद्विजानाति तदल्पम्, अथ यदल्पं तन्मर्त्यमिति', 'वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम्', 'अन्योऽसावन्योऽहम्' इति भेद-

[1] Bh. Gîtâ, 13. 16.
[2] Bh. Gîtâ, 7. 19.
[3] Br. U., 2. 5. 19.
[4] Mu. U., 2. 1. 2.

दर्शननिन्दोपपत्तेरविद्याकृतं द्वैतम् 'एकमेवाद्वितीयम्', 'यत्र त्वस्य', 'तत्र को मोहः कः शोकः' इत्याद्येकत्वविधिश्रुतिभ्यश्चेति ॥ ४० ॥

40. The teacher should say " Whatever is observed (in this world) or learnt from the *Srutis* (regarding the next world) are products of Ignorance. But in reality there is only One, the Self who appears to be many to deluded vision, like the moon appearing to be more than one to eyes affected by amaurosis. That duality is the product of Ignorance follows from the reasonableness of the condemnation by the *Srutis* of the acceptance of (the reality of) difference such as, 'When[1] there is something else as it were,' 'When[2] there is duality as it were, one sees another,' 'He[3] goes from death to death,' 'And[4] where one sees something else, hears something else, cognizes something else, that is finite, and that which is finite is mortal,' 'Modifications[5] (i.e., effects e.g., earthen jars) being only names, have for their support words only, it is earth alone (i.e., the cause) that is real' and 'He[6] is one, I am another.' The same thing follows from the *Srutis* teaching unity, for example, 'One[7] only without a second,' 'When[8] the knower of *Brahman*' and 'What[9] delusion or grief is there ?' "

यद्येवं भगवन्, किमर्थं श्रुत्या साध्यसाधनादिभेद उच्यते उत्पत्तिः प्रलयश्चेति ॥ ४१ ॥

[1] Br. U., 4. 3. 31. [2] Br. U., 2. 4. 14. [3] Br. U., 4. 4. 19.
[4] Chh. U., 7. 24. 1. [5] Chh. U., 6. 1. 4. [6] Br. U., 1. 4. 10.
[7] Chh. U., 6. 2. 1. [8] Br. U., 4. 5. 15. [9] Ish. U., 7.

41. "If it be so, Sir, why do the *Srutis* speak of diverse ends to be attained, their means, and so forth, as also the evolution and the dissolution of the universe ?"

अत्रोच्यते—अविद्यावत उपात्तशरीरादिभेदस्य इष्टानिष्टयोगिनमात्मानं मन्यमानस्य साधनैरेवेष्टानिष्टप्राप्तिपरिहारोपायविवेकमजानतः इष्टप्राप्तिं चानिष्टपरिहारं चेच्छतः शनैस्तद्विषयमज्ञानं निवर्तयितुं शास्त्रं न साध्यसाधनादिभेदं विधत्ते। अनिष्टरूपः संसारो हि स इति तद्भेददृष्टिमेवाविद्यां संसारमुन्मूलयति उत्पत्तिप्रलयाद्येकत्वोपपत्तिप्रदर्शनेन ॥ ४२ ॥

42. "The answer to your question is this : Having acquired (i.e. having identified himself with) the various things such as the body etc. and considering the Self to be connected with what is desirable and what is undesirable and so on, though eager to attain the desirable and avoid the undesirable by appropriate means—for without certain means nothing can be accomplished—an ignorant man cannot discriminate between the means to the realisation of what is (really [1]) desirable for him and the means to the avoidance of what is undesirable. It is the gradual removal [2] of this ignorance that is the aim of the scriptures ; but not the enunciation of (the reality of) the difference of the end, means and so on. For it is this very difference that constitutes this undesirable transmigratory existence. The scriptures, therefore, root out the ignorance constituting this (false) conception of difference which is the cause of phenomenal existence

[1] Self-knowledge. [2] Through the injunction of meritorious actions for the purification of the mind.

by giving reasons for the oneness [1] of the evolution, dissolution, etc. of the universe.

अविद्यायामुन्मूलितायां श्रुतिस्मृतिन्यायेभ्यः अनन्तरमबाह्यम्, सबाह्याभ्यन्तरो ह्यजः, सैन्धवघनवत् प्रज्ञानघन एवैक आत्मा, आकाशवत्परिपूर्णः इत्यत्रैव एका प्रज्ञाप्रतिष्ठा परमार्थदर्शिनो भवति, न साध्यसाधनोत्पत्तिप्रलयादिभेदेन अशुद्धिगन्धोऽप्युपपद्यते ॥ ४३ ॥

43. "When ignorance is uprooted with the aid of the *Sruti*, *Smriti* and reasoning the one-pointed [2] intellect of the seer of the supreme Truth becomes established [3] in the one Self consisting of pure Consciousness like a (homogeneous) lump of salt and all-pervading [4] like the ether, which is within and without, without the interior or exterior and unborn. Even the slightest taint of impurity due to the diversity of ends, means, evolution, dissolution and the rest is, therefore, not reasonable.

तच्चैतत् परमार्थदर्शनं प्रतिपत्तुमिच्छता वर्णाश्रमाद्यभिमानकृतपाङ्क्तरूपपुत्रवित्तलोकैषणादिभ्यो व्युत्थानं कर्तव्यम्। सम्यक्प्रत्ययविरोधात्तदभिमानस्य भेददर्शनप्रतिषेधार्थोपपत्तिश्चोपपद्यते। नह्येकस्मिन्नात्मन्यसंसारित्वबुद्धौ शास्त्रन्यायोत्पादितायां तद्विपरीता बुद्धिर्भवति। नह्यग्नौ शीतत्वबुद्धिः, शरीरे वा अजरामरणबुद्धिः। तस्मादविद्याकार्यत्वात् सर्वकर्मणां तत्साधनानां च यज्ञोपवीतादीनां परमार्थदर्शननिष्ठेन त्यागः कर्तव्यः ॥ ४४ ॥

[1] By showing that the universe is not different from *Brahman*.
[2] Bh. Gîtâ, 2. 41. [3] Bh. Gîtâ, 2. 55.
[4] Just as a rope pervades the snake mistaken for it.

44. "One, eager to realize this right Knowledge spoken of in the *Sruti*, should rise above the desire for a son, wealth and this [1] world and the next which are described in a five-fold [2] manner and are the outcome of a false reference to the Self of castes, orders of life and so on. As this reference is contradictory to right Knowledge it is intelligible why reasons are given [3] regarding the prohibition of the acceptance of (the reality of) difference. For when the Knowledge that the one non-dual Self is beyond phenomenal existence is generated by the scriptures and reasoning there cannot exist (side by side with it) a knowledge contrary to it. None can think of chillness in fire or immortality and freedom from old age in regard to the (perishable) body. One, therefore, who is eager to be established in the Knowledge of the Reality should give up all actions [4] with *yajnopavîta* and the rest, their accessories, which are the effects of ignorance."

HERE ENDS A METHOD OF ENLIGHTENING THE DISCIPLE

[1] See foot-notes 1 and 2 on para 2 above.
[2] Br. U., 1. 4. 17. [3] by the *Srutis*.
[4] Obligatory daily duties enjoined by the *Vedas* occasional rites, rites performed for some particular object and with a view to future fruition and actions prohibited by the *Vedas*.

कूटस्थाद्वयात्मबोधप्रकरणम् ॥ २ ॥

CHAPTER II

THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE CHANGELESS AND NON-DUAL SELF

सुखमासीनं ब्राह्मणं ब्रह्मनिष्ठं कश्चिद्ब्रह्मचारी जन्ममरणलक्षणात् संसारात् निर्विण्णो मुमुक्षुः विधिवदुपसन्नः पप्रच्छ— भगवन्, कथमहं संसारान्मोक्षिष्ये ? शरीरेन्द्रियविषयवेदनावान् जागरिते दुःखमनुभवामि, तथा स्वप्नेऽनुभवामि पुनः पुनः सुषुप्तिप्रतिपत्त्या विश्रम्य विश्रम्य । किमयमेव मम स्वभावः, किं वा अन्यस्वभावस्य सतो नैमित्तिक इति । यदि स्वभावः, न मे मोक्षाशा, स्वभावस्यावर्जनीयत्वात् । अथ नैमित्तिकः, निमित्तपरिहारे स्यान्मोक्षोपपत्तिः ॥ ४५ ॥

45. A certain *Brahmachârin*,[1] tired of the transmigratory existence consisting of birth and death and aspiring after liberation, approached in the prescribed manner[2] a Knower of *Brahman* established in It and sitting at ease and said, " How can I, Sir, be liberated from this

[1] One belonging to the first of the four orders of life, a student.
[2] Bh. Gîtâ, 4. 34.

transmigratory existence? Conscious of the body, the senses and their objects I feel pain in the state of waking and also in dream again and again after intervals of rest in deep sleep experienced by me. Is this my own nature or is it causal, I being of a different nature? If it be my own nature I can have no hope of liberation as one's own nature cannot be got rid of. But if it be causal, liberation from it may be possible by removing the cause."

तं गुरुरुवाच—शृणु वत्स, न तवायं स्वभावः। किंतु नैमित्तिकः ॥ ४६ ॥

46. The teacher said to him, "Listen, my child, it is *not* your nature but *causal*."

इति उक्तः शिष्य उवाच—किं निमित्तं, किं वा तस्य निवर्तकम्, को वा मम स्वभावः, यस्मिन्निमित्ते निवर्तिते नैमित्तिकाभावः, रोगनिमित्तनिवृत्ताविव रोगी स्वभावं प्रपद्येयेति ॥ ४७ ॥

47. Told thus the disciple said, "What is the cause, what will bring it to an end and what is my nature? That cause being brought to an end, there will be the absence of the effect, and I shall come by my own nature, just like a patient who gets back the normal condition (of his health) when the cause of his disease is removed."

गुरुरुवाच—अविद्या निमित्तं, विद्या तस्य निवर्तिका, अविद्यायां निवृत्तायां तन्निमित्ताभावात् मोक्ष्यसे जन्ममरणलक्षणात्, स्वप्नजाग्रद्दुःखं च नानुभविष्यसीति ॥ ४८ ॥

48. The teacher said, "The cause is Ignorance. Knowledge brings it to an end. When Ignorance, the cause, will be removed you will be liberated from the transmigratory existence consisting of birth and death. You will never again feel pain [1] in the states of waking and dream."

शिष्य उवाच—का सा अविद्या, किंविषया वा, विद्या च का यया स्वभावं प्रतिपद्येयेति ॥ ४९ ॥

49. The disciple said, "What is that Ignorance? (what is its seat? [2]) and what is its object? [2] What is Knowledge by means of which I may come by my own nature?"

गुरुरुवाच—त्वं परमात्मानं सन्तं असंसारिणं संसार्यहमस्मीति विपरीतं प्रतिपद्यसे, अकर्तारं सन्तं कर्तेति, अभोक्तारं सन्तं भोक्तेति, विद्यमानं च अविद्यमानमिति, इयमविद्या ॥५०॥

50. The teacher said, "You are the non-transmigratory Supreme Self, but you wrongly think that you are one liable to transmigration. (Similarly), not being an agent or an experiencer you wrongly consider yourself to be so. Again, you are eternal but mistake yourself to be non-eternal. This is Ignorance."

शिष्य उवाच—यद्यप्यहं विद्यमानः तथापि न परमात्मा। कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वलक्षणः संसारो मम स्वभावः, प्रत्यक्षादिभिः प्रमाणैः

[1] As real and pertaining to the Self.

[2] The seat and the object of Ignorance is Pure Consciousness, the Self.

अनुभूयमानत्वात्; न अविद्यानिमित्तः, अविद्यायाः स्वात्मविषयत्वानुपपत्तेः। अविद्या नाम अन्यस्मिन् अन्यधर्माध्यारोपणा—यथा प्रसिद्धं रजतं प्रसिद्धायां शुक्तिकायां, यथा प्रसिद्धं पुरुषं स्थाणावध्यारोपयति, प्रसिद्धं वा स्थाणुं पुरुषे। नाऽप्रसिद्धं प्रसिद्धे, प्रसिद्धं चाऽप्रसिद्धे। न चात्मन्यनात्मानमध्यारोपयति, आत्मनः अप्रसिद्धत्वात्। तथा आत्मानं अनात्मनि, आत्मनोऽप्रसिद्धत्वादेव ॥ ५१ ॥

51. The disciple said, "Though eternal I am not the Supreme Self. My nature is one of transmigratory existence consisting of agency and experiencing of its results as it is known by evidences such as sense-perception etc. It is not due to Ignorance. For it cannot have the innermost Self for its object. Ignorance consists of the superimposition of the qualities of one thing on another e.g., well-known silver on well-known mother of pearl or a well known human being on a (well-known) trunk of a tree and *vice versa.* An unknown thing cannot be superimposed on a known one and *vice versa.* The non-Self cannot be superimposed on the Self which is not known. Similarly, the Self cannot be superimposed on the non-Self for the very same reason."

तं गुरुरुवाच—न, व्यभिचारात्। नहि वत्स, प्रसिद्धं प्रसिद्ध एवाध्यारोपयतीति नियन्तुं शक्यम्। आत्मन्यध्यारोपणदर्शनात्। गौरोऽहं कृष्णोऽहमिति देहधर्मस्य अहंप्रत्ययविषये आत्मनि, अहंप्रत्ययविषयस्य च आत्मनः देहे अयमस्मीति ॥ ५२ ॥

52. The teacher said to him, "It is not so. There are exceptions. For, my child, there cannot be a rule that it is only well-known things[1] that are superimposed on other well-known things, for we meet with the superimposition of certain things on the Self. Fairness and blackness, the properties of the body, are superimposed[2] on the Self which is the object of the consciousness 'I,' and the same Self is superimposed on the body."[3]

शिष्य आह—प्रसिद्ध एव तर्ह्यात्मा अहंप्रत्ययविषयतया, देहश्च अयमिति । तत्रैवं सति प्रसिद्धयोरेव देहात्मनोरितरेतराध्यारोपणात् स्थाणुपुरुषयो. शुक्तिकारजतयोरिव । तत्र कं विशेषमाश्रित्य भगवतोक्तं प्रसिद्धयोरितरेतराध्यारोपणेति नियन्तुं न शक्यते इति ॥ ५३ ॥

53. The disciple said, "In that case the Self must be well-known owing to Its being the object of the consciousness 'I'. The body also must be well-known, for it is spoken of as 'this' (body). When this is so, it is a case of mutual superimposition of the well-known body and the well-known Self, like that of a human being and the trunk of a tree or that of silver and mother of pearl. (There is, therefore, no exception here.) So what is the peculiarity with reference to which you said that there could not be a rule that mutual superimposition was possible of two well-known things only?"

[1] Objects of knowledge.
[2] When one says 'I am fair' or 'I am black.'
[3] When one says 'I am a man.'

गुरुराह—शृणु। सत्यं प्रसिद्धौ देहात्मानौ, न तु स्थाणुपुरुषाविव विविक्तप्रत्ययविषयतया सर्वलोकप्रसिद्धौ। कथं तर्हि? नित्यमेव निरन्तराविविक्तप्रत्ययविषयतया। नहि अयं देहः, अयमात्मा, इति विविक्ताभ्यां प्रत्ययाभ्यां देहात्मानौ गृह्णाति यतः कश्चित्। अत एव हि मोमुह्यते लोकः आत्मानात्मविषये एवमात्मा नैवमात्मा इति। इमं विशेषमाश्रित्यावोचं नैवं नियन्तुं शक्यमिति ॥ ५४ ॥

54. The teacher said, "Listen. It is true that the Self and the body are well-known, but they are not well-known to all people to be objects of different knowledges, like a human being and a trunk of a tree. (Question). How are they known then ? (Reply). (They are always known) to be the objects of an undifferentiated knowledge. For, no one knows them to be the objects of different knowledges saying, 'This is the body' and 'This is the Self'. It is for this reason that people are deluded about the nature of the Self and of the non-Self, and say, 'The Self is of this nature' and 'It is not of this nature'. It was this peculiarity with reference to which I said that there was no such rule (viz. only well-known things could he superimposed on each other)."

ननु अविद्याध्यारोपितं यत्र यत्, तदसत् तत्र दृष्टं, यथा रजतं शुक्तिकायां, स्थाणौ पुरुषः, रज्ज्वां सर्पः, आकाशे तलमलिनत्वमित्यादि तथा देहात्मनोरपि नित्यमेव निरन्तराविविक्तप्रत्ययतया इतरेतराध्यारोपणा कृता स्यात्, तदितरेतरयोः

नित्यमेव असत्त्वं स्यात् । यथा शुक्तिकादिषु अविद्याध्यारोपितानां रजतादीनां नित्यमेव अत्यन्तासत्त्वं, तद्विपरीतानां च विपरीतेषु, तद्वत् देहात्मनोरविद्ययैव इतरेतराध्यारोपणा कृता स्यात् । तत्रैवं सति देहात्मनोरसत्त्वं प्रसज्येत । तच्चानिष्टं, वैनाशिकपक्षत्वात् । अथ तद्विपर्ययेण देहः आत्मन्यविद्ययाऽध्यारोपितः, देहस्यात्मनि सति असत्त्वं प्रसज्येत । तच्चानिष्टं, प्रत्यक्षादिविरोधात् । तस्माद्देहात्मानौ नाविद्यया इतरेतरस्मिन् अध्यारोपितौ । कथं तर्हि, वंशस्तम्भवन्नित्यसंयुक्तौ ॥ ५५ ॥

55. Disciple.—" Whatever is superimposed through Ignorance on anything else is found to be non-existent in that thing, e.g., silver [1] in mother of pearl, a human being in the trunk of a tree, a snake in a rope, and the form of a frying pan and blueness in the sky. Similarly, both the body and the Self, always the objects of an undifferentiated knowledge, would be non-existent in each other if they were mutually superimposed. Just as silver etc., superimposed on mother of pearl and other things and *vice versa* are always absolutely non-existent. Likewise, the Self and the non-Self would both be non-existent if they were similarly superimposed on each other through Ignorance. But that is not desirable as it is the position of the Nihilists. If, instead of a mutual superimposition, the body (alone) is superimposed through Ignorance on the Self the body will be non-existent in the existing Self.[2] That is also not

[1] It is non-existent in mother of pearl on which it is superimposed.

[2] The disciple means by the word 'Self' the consciousness, 'I'.

desirable. For it contradicts sense-perception etc. Therefore the body and the Self are not mutually superimposed due to Ignorance. (If they are not superimposed) what then? They are always in the relation of conjunction with each other like pillars and bamboos."[1]

न । अनित्यत्वपरार्थत्वप्रसङ्गात् । संहतत्वात् परार्थत्वं अनित्यत्वं च, वंशस्तम्भादिवदेव । किंच यस्तु परैर्देहेन संहतः कल्पित आत्मा स संहतत्वात् परार्थः । तेन असंहतः परोऽन्यो नित्यः सिद्धस्तावत् ॥ ५६ ॥

56. Teacher.—"It is not so. For in that case there arises the possibility of the Self existing for the benefit of another[2] and being non-eternal. The Self, if in contact with the body, would be existing for the benefit of another[2] and be non-eternal like the combination of pillars and bamboos. Moreover, the Self, supposed by other philosophers to be conjoined with the body, must have an existence for the sake of another.[2] It is, therefore, concluded that devoid of contact with the body the Self is eternal and characteristically different from it."

तस्यासंहतस्य देहे देहमात्रतया अध्यारोपितत्वेन असत्त्वानित्यत्वादिदोषप्रसङ्गो भवति । तत्र निरात्मको देह इति वैनाशिकपक्षप्राप्तिदोषः स्यात् ॥ ५७ ॥

[1] Just as a combination of pillars and bamboos is called a house, so the combination of the Self and the body is called a man.

[2] Another conscious Being.

57. Disciple.—"The objections that the Self as the body only[1] is non-existent, non-eternal and so on, hold good if the Self which is not[2] conjoined with the body[3] were superimposed on it.[4] The body would then be without a Self[5] and so the Nihilist position comes in."

न । स्वत एवात्मनः आकाशस्येव असंहतत्वाभ्युपगमात् । सर्वेणासंहतः स च आत्मेति न निरात्मको देहादिः सर्वः स्यात् । यथा च आकाशं सर्वेणासंहतमिति सर्वं न निराकाशं भवति, एवम् । तस्मान्न वैनाशिकपक्षप्राप्तिदोषः स्यात् ॥ ५८ ॥

58. Teacher.—"No. (You are not right). For we admit that, like the ether, the Self is by nature free from contact with anything. Just as things are not bereft of the ether though it is not in contact with them, so, the body etc., are not devoid of the Self though It is not in contact with them. Therefore the objection of the Nihilist position coming in does not arise.

यत्पुनरुक्तं, देहस्यात्यन्तासत्त्वे प्रत्यक्षादिविरोधः स्यादिति । तन्न । प्रत्यक्षादिभिः आत्मनि देहस्य सत्त्वानुपलब्धेः । नह्यात्मनि, कुण्डे बदरं, क्षीरे सर्पिः, तिले तैलं, भित्तौ चित्रमिव च, प्रत्यक्षादिभिः देह उपलभ्यते । तस्मान्न प्रत्यक्षादिविरोधः ॥ ५९ ॥

[1] For, being superimposed the Self is non-existent.

[2] The relation of conjunction between the Self and the body is not admitted by the teacher.

[3] The relation of conjunction failing, that of false identity comes in. For we must explain the idea, 'I am a man'.

[4] The body again is superimposed on the Self according to the teacher.

[5] And the Self would be without a body.

59. " It is not a fact[1] that the absolute non-existence of the body contradicts sense-perception etc. inasmuch as the existence of the body in the Self is not known by these evidences. The body is not known to exist in the Self by perception etc. like a plum in a hole, ghee in milk, oil in sesame or a picture painted on a wall. There is, therefore, no[2] contradiction to sense-perception etc."

कथं तर्हि प्रत्यक्षाद्यप्रसिद्धात्मनि देहाद्यध्यारोपणा, देहे च आत्मारोपणा ? ॥ ६० ॥

60. Disciple.—" How can then there be the superimposition of the body etc. on the Self which is not known by sense-perception etc. and that of the Self on the body ? "

नायं दोषः । स्वभावप्रसिद्धत्वादात्मनः । नहि कादाचित्कत्वसिद्धावेव अध्यारोपणा, न नित्यसिद्धौ, इति नियन्तुं शक्यं, आकाशे तलमलाद्यध्यारोपणदर्शनात् ॥ ६१ ॥

61. Teacher.—" It is not a (valid) objection. For the Self is naturally well-known. As we see the form of a frying pan and blueness superimposed on the sky

[1] As stated by the disciple. See para 55 above.

[2] One, therefore, should not refuse to accept mutual superimposition on the false ground that it contradicts sense-perception etc.

As a matter of fact it is only the qualities like consciousness etc. of the Self and not the Self itself that is superimposed, though the non-Self itself and its qualities are superimposed. Hence Nihilism does not come in.

See Padmapâda's gloss (Panchapâdikâ, Division 1) where it is explained how consciousness is a quality of the Self.

there cannot be a rule that it is things known *occasionally* only on which superimposition is possible and not on things *always* known."[1]

किं भगवन्, देहात्मनोः इतरेतराध्यारोपणा देहादिसंघातकृता अथवा आत्मकृतेति ॥ ६२ ॥

62. Disciple.—"Sir, is the mutual superimposition of the body and the Self made by the combination of the body etc. or by the Self?"

गुरुरुवाच—यदि देहादिसंघातकृता, यदि वा आत्मकृता, किं तत्र स्यात् ॥ ६३ ॥

63. The teacher said, "Does it matter if it be made by the one or the other?"

इत्युक्तः शिष्य आह—यद्यहं देहादिसंघातमात्रः, ततो ममाचेतनत्वात् परार्थत्वमिति न मत्कृता देहात्मनोः इतरेतराध्यारोपणा। अथाहमात्मा परोऽन्यः संघातात्, चितिमत्त्वात् स्वार्थ इति मयैव चितिमता आत्मनि अध्यारोपणा क्रियते सर्वानर्थबीजभूता ॥ ६४ ॥

64. Questioned thus the disciple said, "If I were only a combination of the body etc. I would be nonconscious and would exist for the sake of another only. Therefore the mutual superimposition of the body and the Self could not be made by me. If, on the other hand, I were the Self I would be characteristically different from the combination of the body etc., would

[1] e.g., the Self.

be conscious and, therefore, would exist entirely for myself. So it is I, a conscious being, who make that superimposition, the root of all evils, on the Self."

इत्युक्तो गुरुरुवाच—अनर्थबीजभूतां चेत् मिथ्याध्यारोपणां जानीषे, मा कार्षीस्तर्हि ॥ ६५ ॥

65. Thus told the teacher said, "Do not[1] make any superimposition if you know it to be the root of all evils."

नैव भगवन्, शक्नोमि न कर्तुम्। अन्येन केनचित् प्रयुक्तोऽहं, न स्वतन्त्र इति ॥ ६६ ॥

66. Disciple.—"Sir, I cannot but make it, I am not independent. I am made to act by someone else."

न तर्हि अचितिमत्त्वात् स्वार्थः त्वम्। येन प्रयुक्तः अस्वतन्त्रः प्रवर्तसे, स चितिमान् स्वार्थः, संघात एव त्वम् ॥ ६७ ॥

67. Teacher.—"Then you do not exist for yourself as you are non-conscious. That by which you are made to act like one dependent on another is conscious and exists for itself. You are only a combination (of the body and other things)."

यद्यचेतनोऽहं, कथं सुखदुःखवेदनां भवदुक्तं च जानामि ॥६८॥

68. Disciple.—"How am I conscious of pain and pleasure and also of what you say if I be non-conscious?"

[1] *i.e.*, give it up. Know that you are Pure Consciousness and never really identified with the body etc.

गुरुरुवाच—किं सुखदुःखवेदनाया मदुक्ताच्चान्यस्त्वं, किं वा अनन्य एवेति ॥ ६९ ॥

69. Teacher.—" Are you different from the consciousness of pain and pleasure and from what I say, or not ? "

शिष्य उवाच—नाहं तावदनन्यः। कस्मात्? यस्मात्तदुभयं कर्मभूतं घटादिकमिव जानामि। यद्यनन्योऽहं, तेन तदुभयं न जानीयां; किंतु जानामि, तस्मादन्यः। सुखदुःखवेदनाविक्रिया च स्वार्थैव प्राप्नोति, त्वदुक्तं च स्यात् अनन्यत्वे, न च तयोः स्वार्थता युक्ता। नहि चन्दनकण्टककृते सुखदुःखे चन्दनकण्टकार्थे, घटोपयोगो वा घटार्थः। तस्मात् तद्विज्ञातुर्मम चन्दनादिकृतः अर्थः। अहं हि ततोऽन्यः समस्तमर्थं जानामि बुद्ध्यारूढम् ॥ ७० ॥

70. The disciple said, " It is not a fact that I am not different from them. For I know them to be objects of my knowledge like jars and other things. If I were not different I could not know them. But I know them ; so I am different. If I were not different the modifications of the mind called pain and pleasure and the words spoken by you would exist for themselves. But that is not reasonable. For pleasure and pain produced by sandal paste and a thorn respectively and also the use of a jar are not for their own sake. Therefore the purposes served by sandle paste etc. are for the sake of me who am their knower. I am different from them as I know all things pervaded by the intellect."

तं गुरुरुवाच—एवं तर्हि स्वार्थस्त्वं, चितिमत्त्वान्न परेण प्रयुज्यसे । नहि चितिमान् परतन्त्रः परेण प्रयुज्यते, चितिमतश्चितिमदर्थत्वानुपपत्तेः, समत्वात्, प्रदीपप्रकाशयोरिव । नापि अचितिमदर्थत्वं चितिमतो भवति, अचितिमतोऽचितिमत्त्वादेव स्वार्थसंबन्धानुपपत्तेः । नापि अचितिमतोः अन्योन्यार्थत्वं दृष्टम् । नहि काष्ठकुड्ये अन्योन्यार्थं कुर्वाते ॥ ७१ ॥

71. The teacher said to him, " As you are possessed of consciousness, you exist for yourself and are not made to act by anyone else. For an independent conscious being is not made to act by another as it is not reasonable that one possessed of consciousness exists for the sake of another possessing consciousness, both being of the same nature like the lights of two lamps. Nor does one possessed of consciousness exist for the sake of another having no consciousness ; for it is not possible that a thing exists for itself for the very fact that it is non-conscious. Nor again is it seen that two non-conscious things exist for each other, as wood and a wall do not serve each other's purpose."

ननु चितिमत्त्वे समेऽपि भृत्यस्वामिनोः अन्योन्यार्थत्वं दृष्टम् ॥ ७२ ॥

72. Disciple.—" But it may be said that the servant and the master are seen to serve each other's purpose though they are equally possessed of consciousness."

नैवम् , अग्नेरुष्णप्रकाशवत् तव चितिमत्त्वस्य विवक्षितत्वात् । प्रदर्शितश्च दृष्टान्तः प्रदीपप्रकाशयोरिति । तत्रैवं सति

स्वबुद्ध्यारूढमेव सर्वमुपलभसे अग्न्युष्णप्रकाशतुल्येन कूटस्थनित्य-चैतन्यस्वरूपेण । यदि चैवम्, आत्मनः सर्वदा निर्विशेषत्वमुप-गच्छसि । किमित्यूचिवान्, सुषुप्ते विश्रम्य विश्रम्य जाग्रत्स्व-प्नयोः दुःखमनुभवामि इति । किं अयमेव मम स्वभावः, किं वा नैमित्तिकः इति च । किमसौ व्यामोहोऽपगतः, किं वा नेति ॥७३॥

73. Teacher.—"It is not[1] so. For I speak of consciousness belonging to you like heat and light to fire. It is for this reason that I cited the example of the lights of two lamps. Therefore, as changeless and eternal consciousness, like the heat and light of fire, you know everything[2] presented to your intellect. Thus when you always know the Self to be without any attribute why did you say,[3] 'I experience pain and pleasure again and again during the states of waking and dream after intervals of rest in deep sleep?' And why did you say, 'Is it my own nature or causal?' Has this delusion vanished or not?"

इत्युक्तः शिष्य आह—भगवन्, अपगतः त्वत्प्रसादात् व्यामोहः, किं तु मम कूटस्थतायां संशयः । कथम्? शब्दादीनां स्वतःसिद्धिर्नास्ति, अचेतनत्वात् । शब्दाद्याकारप्रत्ययोत्पत्तेस्तु तेषां; प्रत्ययानामितरेतरव्यावृत्तविशेषणानां नीलपीताद्याकारवतां स्वतःसिद्ध्यसंभवात् । तस्माद्बाह्याकारनिमित्तत्वं गम्यते, इति बाह्याकारवत् शब्दाद्याकारत्वसिद्धिः । तथा प्रत्ययानामपि अहं-

[1] For the non-conscious portion in each is of service to the conscious portion in the other.

[2] Superimposed on you, changeless, pure Consciousness.

[3] See para 45 above.

प्रत्ययालम्बनवस्तुभेदानां संहतत्वात् अचैतन्योपपत्तेः स्वार्थत्वासंभवात् स्वरूपव्यतिरिक्तग्राहकग्राह्यत्वेन सिद्धिः ; शब्दादिवदेव । असंहतत्वे सति चैतन्यात्मकत्वात् स्वार्थोऽपि अहंप्रत्ययानां नीलपीताद्याकाराणामुपलब्धेति विक्रियावानेव, कूटस्थः इति संशयः ॥ ७४ ॥

74. To this the disciple replied, "The delusion,[1] Sir, is gone by your grace; but I have doubts about the changeless nature which, you say, pertains to me."

Teacher.—"What doubts?"

Disciple.—"Sound etc.,[2] do not exist independently as they are non-conscious. But they come into existence when there arise in the mind modifications resembling sound and so on. It is impossible[3] that these modifications[4] should have an independent existence[5] as they are exclusive of one another as regards their special characteristics (of resembling sound etc.,) and appear to be blue, yellow, etc. (So sound etc., are not the same as mental modifications.) It is therefore inferred that these modifications are caused by external objects. So it is proved that modifications resemble sound etc., objects existing externally.[3] Similarly,[6] these different modifications of the mind also are combinations and therefore non-conscious. So, not existing for their own

[1] *i.e.*, "I am liable to transmigration and misery and other than the Lord who is ever free."

[2] Sound, touch, sight, taste and smell.

[3] Refutation of the Idealists.

[4] *i.e.*, sound consciousness, touch consciousness, colour consciousness, etc.

[5] It is only pure Consciousness that has an independent existence.

[6] like sound etc.

sake they, like sound etc., exist only when known by one [1] different from them. Though the Self is not a combination, consists of Consciousness and exists for Its own sake, It is the *knower* [2] of the mental modifications appearing to be blue, yellow and so on. It must, therefore, be of a *changeful* nature. Hence is the doubt about the changeless nature of the Self."

तं गुरुरुवाच—न युक्तस्तव संशयः। यतस्तेषां प्रत्ययानां नियमेन अशेषतः उपलब्धेरेव अपरिणामित्वात् कूटस्थत्वसिद्धौ, निश्चयहेतुमेव अशेषचित्तप्रचारोपलब्धिं संशयहेतुमात्थ। यदि हि तव परिणामित्वं स्यात्, अशेषस्वविषयचित्तप्रचारोपलब्धिर्न स्यात्, चित्तस्येव स्वविषये, यथा चेन्द्रियाणां स्वविषयेषु। न च तथाऽत्मनस्तव स्वविषयैकदेशोपलब्धिः। अतः कूटस्थतैव तवेति ॥ ७५ ॥

75. The teacher said to him, "Your doubt is not justifiable. For you, the Self, are proved to be free from change, and therefore perpetually the same on the ground that all the modifications of the mind without a single exception are (simultaneously) known by you. You regard this knowledge of all the modifications which is the reason for the above inference as that for your doubt. If you were changeful like the mind or the senses (which pervade their objects one after another), you would not simultaneously know all the mental modifications, the objects of your knowledge. Nor are you aware of a portion only of the objects of your

[1] The Self. [2] The disciple means the agent of the action of knowing the modifications.

knowledge (at a time). You are, therefore, absolutely changeless."[1]

तत्राह—उपलब्धिर्नाम धात्वर्थो विक्रियैव, उपलब्धुः कूटस्थात्मता चेति विरुद्धम् ॥ ७६ ॥

76. The disciple said, "knowledge is the meaning of a root[2] and therefore surely consists of a change;[3] and the knower,[4] (as you say) is of a changeless nature. This is a contradiction."

न। धात्वर्थविक्रियायां उपलब्ध्युपचारात्। यो हि बौद्धः प्रत्ययः स धात्वर्थो विक्रियात्मकः आत्मनः उपलब्ध्याभासफलावसान इति उपलब्धिशब्देन उपचर्यते। यथा छिदिक्रिया द्वैधीभावफलावसानेति धात्वर्थत्वेन उपचर्यते, तद्वत् ॥ ७७ ॥

77. Teacher.—"It is not so. For the word knowledge is used only in a secondary sense to mean a change called an action, the meaning of a root. A modification of the intellect called an action ends in a result in itself which is the reflection of Knowledge, the Self. It is for this reason that this modification is called knowledge in a secondary[5] sense, just as the action of cutting (a thing), producing and including the ultimate result viz., its separation in two parts is secondarily called the meaning of the root (to cut).

इत्युक्तः शिष्य आह—ननु भगवन्, मम कूटस्थत्वप्रतिपादनं प्रति असमर्थो दृष्टान्तः। कथम्? छिदिः छेद्यविक्रियावसाना

[1] Verse 7. Chap. 14 and verses 156—158, Chap. 18.
[2] To know. [3] For every root means an action.
[4] The disciple means the agent of the action of knowing.
[5] See verses 53 and 54, Chap. 18.

उपचर्यते यथा धात्वर्थत्वेन, तथा उपलब्धिशब्दोपचरितोऽपि धात्वर्थो बौद्धप्रत्ययः आत्मनः उपलब्धिविक्रियावसानश्चेत्, नात्मनः कूटस्थतां प्रतिपादयितुं समर्थः ॥ ७८ ॥

78. Told thus the disciple said, "Sir, the example cited by you cannot prove that I am changeless."

Teacher.—"How ?"

Disciple.—"For, just as the action of cutting, producing and including the ultimate change in the thing to be cut, is secondarily called the meaning of the root (to cut), so, the word knowledge is used secondarily for the mental modification which is the meaning of the root (to know) and which ends in the result that is a *change in knowledge*, the Self. The example cited by you cannot, therefore, establish the changeless nature of the Self."

गुरुरुवाच—सत्यमेवं स्यात्, यदि उपलब्ध्युपलब्ध्रोः विशेषः। नित्योपलब्धिमात्र एव हि उपलब्धा, न तु तार्किकसमय इव अन्या उपलब्धिः, अन्य उपलब्धा च ॥ ७९ ॥

79. The teacher said, "What you say would be true if there were a distinction existing between the Knower and Knowledge. For, the Knower is eternal Knowledge only.[1] The Knower and Knowledge are not different as they are in the argumentative [2] philosophy."

ननु उपलब्धिफलावसानो धात्वर्थः कथमिति ॥ ८० ॥

80. Disciple.—"How is it then that an action ends in a result which is Knowledge ?"[3]

[1] Pure Knowledge. [2] The philosophy of the Naiyâyikas.

[3] For Knowledge is spoken of as eternal in the previous paragraph. A result cannot, of course, be eternal.

उच्यते—शृणु, उपलब्ध्याभासफलावसान इत्युक्तं, किं न श्रुतं तत् त्वया? न तु आत्मा विक्रियोत्पादनावसान इति मयोक्तम् ॥ ८१ ॥

81. The teacher said, " Listen. It was said (that the mental modification, called an action) ended in a result which was the *reflection* [1] of Knowledge. Did you not hear it? I did not say [2] that a change was produced in the *Self* as a result (of the modification of the mind)."

शिष्य उवाच—कथं तर्हि कूटस्थे मयि अशेषस्वविषयचित्तप्रचारोपलब्धृत्वमित्यात्थ ॥ ८२ ॥

82. The disciple said, " How then am I, who am changeless, the knower, as you say,[3] of all the mental modifications, the objects of my knowledge?"

तं गुरुरुवाच—सत्यमवोचं, तेनैव कूटस्थतामब्रुवं तव ॥८३॥

83. The teacher said to him, " I told you the right thing. The very fact (that you know simultaneously all the mental modifications) was adduced by me as the reason why you are eternally immutable."

यद्येवं भगवन्, कूटस्थनित्योपलब्धिस्वरूपे मयि शब्दाद्याकारबौद्धप्रत्ययेषु च मत्स्वरूपोपलब्ध्याभासफलावसानवत्सु उत्पद्यमानेषु, कस्त्वपराधो मम ॥ ८४ ॥

84. Disciple.—" If this is so, Sir, what is my fault when the mental changes resembling sound etc. and

[1] Para 77 above. [2] I did not say that a modification ended in a result that was Knowledge (the Self). [3] See Para 75 above.

resulting in the *reflection*[1] of knowledge,[2] My own nature, are produced in Me who am of the nature of changeless and eternal Consciousness ?"

सत्यम्, नास्त्यपराधः, किंतु अविद्यामात्रस्तु अपराध इति प्रागेवावोचम् ॥ ८५ ॥

85. Teacher.—"It is true that you are not to be blamed. Ignorance, as I told you before,[3] is the only fault."

यदि भगवन्, सुषुप्त इव मम विक्रिया नास्ति, कथं स्वप्नजागरिते ॥ ८६ ॥

86. Disciple.—" Sir, why are there the states of dream and waking (in me) if I am absolutely changeless like one in deep sleep ?"

तं गुरुरुवाच—किंतु अनुभूयेते त्वया सततम् ॥ ८७ ॥

87. The teacher said to him, "But you always experience them (whenever they arise)."

बाढम् अनुभवामि, किंतु विच्छिद्यविच्छिद्य, न तु सन्ततम् ॥ ८८ ॥

88. Disciple.—"Yes, I experience them, at intervals but not continuously."

तं गुरुरुवाच—तर्हि आगन्तुके त्वेते, न तवात्मभूते। यदि तवात्मभूते चैतन्यस्वरूपवत् स्वतःसिद्धे, सन्तते एव स्याताम्। किंच स्वप्नजागरिते न तव आत्मभूते, व्यभिचारित्वात्,

[1] Para 77 above. [2] Pure Consciousness. [3] Paras 48—50 above.

वस्त्रादिवत् । नहि यस्य यत्स्वरूपं तत् तद्व्यभिचारि दृष्टम् । स्वप्नजागरिते तु चैतन्यमात्रत्वात् व्यभिचरतः । सुषुप्ते चेत् स्वरूपं व्यभिचरेत्, तन्नष्टं नास्तीति वा बाध्यमेव स्यात्, आगन्तुकानां अतद्धर्माणां उभयात्मकत्वदर्शनात्, यथा धनवस्त्रादीनां नाशो दृष्टः, स्वप्नभ्रान्तिलब्धानां तु अभावो दृष्टः ॥ ८९ ॥

89. The teacher said, "They are then adventitious only and are not your own nature. They would surely be continuous [1] if they were self-existent like Pure Consciousness which is your own nature. Moreover, they are not your own nature inasmuch as they are non-persistent like clothes and other things. For what is one's own nature is never seen to cease to persist while one is persisting. But waking and dream cease to persist while Pure Consciousness continues to do so. Pure Consciousness, the Self, persisting in deep sleep, whatever is non-persistent (at that time) is either destroyed [2] or negated [2] inasmuch as adventitious things, never the properties of one's own nature, are found to possess these characteristics ; for example, the destruction of money, clothes, etc. and the negation of things acquired in dream or delusion are seen.

नन्वेवं भगवन्, चैतन्यस्वरूपमपि आगन्तुकं प्राप्तम्, स्वप्नजागरितयोरिव, सुषुप्ते अनुपलब्धेः । अचैतन्यस्वरूपो वा स्यामहम् ॥ ९० ॥

[1] And hence would always be experienced by you. [2] In both these cases they cannot be regarded as really belonging to the Self.

90. Disciple.—" But, Sir, when this is so, Pure Consciousness Itself has to be admitted [1] to be adventitious like waking and dream. For it is not known in deep sleep. Or, (it may be that I have adventitious consciousness or) am non-conscious by nature."

न, पश्य, तदनुपपत्तेः । चैतन्यस्वरूपं चेत् आगन्तुकं पश्यसि, पश्य । तैतद्वर्षशतेनापि उपपत्त्या कल्पयितुं शक्नुमो वयम्, अन्यो वाऽचैतन्योऽपि । संहतत्वात् पारार्थ्यं अनेकत्वं नाशित्वं च न केनचित् उपपत्त्या वारयितुं शक्यम् । अस्वार्थस्य स्वतःसिद्ध्यभावादित्यवोचाम । चैतन्यस्वरूपस्य तु आत्मनः स्वतःसिद्धेः अन्यानपेक्षत्वं न केनचित् वारयितुं शक्यम्, अव्यभिचारात् ॥ ९१ ॥

91. Teacher.—" No. (What you say is not right.) Think over it. It is not reasonable (to say so). You may look upon Pure Consciousness as adventitious (if you are wise enough) ; but we cannot prove It to be so by reasoning even in a hundred years, nor (can It be proved to be so) even by a dull [2] man. As the consciousness (that has for its adjuncts mental modifications) is a combination no one can disprove its existence for the sake of another, its manyness and destructibility by any reasoning whatever ; for we have already [3] said that whatsoever does not exist for itself is not

[1] The ideas, 'I am a seer,' 'I am a hearer,' etc. showing consciousness in one in dream and waking are absent in deep sleep together with the two states. The disciple's idea is : 'When the two states are not there in deep sleep, my consciousness is also not there.' [2] i.e., no one can be so dull as to prove It to be so.
[3] See para 74 above.

self-existent. As Pure Consciousness, the Self, is self-existent no one can disprove Its independence of other things inasmuch as It never ceases to exist."

ननु व्यभिचारो दर्शितो मया, सुषुप्ते न पश्यामीति ॥ ९२ ॥

92. Disciple.—" But I have shown [1] an exception,[2] namely, I have no consciousness in deep sleep."

न । व्याहतत्वात् । कथं व्याघातः ? पश्यतस्तव न पश्यामि इति व्याहतं वचनम् । नहि कदाचित् भगवन्, सुषुप्ते मया चैतन्यं अन्यद्वा किंचित् दृष्टम् । पश्यन् तर्हि सुषुप्ते त्वम् । यस्मात् दृष्टमेव प्रतिषेधसि, न दृष्टिम् । या तव दृष्टिः तत् चैतन्यमिति मयोक्तम् । यया त्वं विद्यमानया न किंचित् दृष्टमिति प्रतिषेधसि, सा दृष्टिः तच्चैतन्यम् । तर्हि सर्वत्र अव्यभिचारात् कूटस्थनित्यत्वं सिद्धं स्वत एव, न प्रमाणापेक्षम् । स्वतःसिद्धस्य हि प्रमातुः अन्यस्य प्रमेयस्य परिच्छित्तिं प्रति प्रमाणापेक्षा । या तु अन्या नित्या परिच्छित्तिः अपेक्ष्यते, अन्यस्य अपरिच्छित्तिरूपस्य परिच्छेदाय, सा हि नित्यैव कूटस्था स्वयंज्योतिःस्वभावा । आत्मनि प्रमाणत्वे प्रमातृत्वे वा न तां प्रति प्रमाणापेक्षा, तत्स्वभावत्वात् । यथा प्रकाशनं उष्णत्वं वा लोहोदकादिषु परतः अपेक्ष्यते अग्न्यादित्यादिभ्यः, अतत्स्वभावत्वात्, न अग्न्यादित्यादीनां तदपेक्षा, सर्वदा तत्स्वभावत्वात् ॥ ९३ ॥

93. Teacher.—" No, you contradict yourself."

Disciple—" How is it a contradiction ? "

[1] See para 90 above. [2] To the persistence of Pure Consciousness.

Teacher.—"You contradict yourself by saying that you are not conscious when, as a matter of fact, you *are* so."

Disciple.—"But, Sir, I was never conscious of consciousness or anything else in deep sleep."

Teacher.—"You are then conscious in deep sleep. For you deny the existence of the *objects* of Knowledge (in that state), but not that of *Knowledge.* I have told you that what is *your* consciousness is nothing but absolute Knowledge. The Consciousness owing to whose presence you deny (the existence of things in deep sleep) by saying, 'I was conscious of nothing' is the Knowledge, the Consciousness which is your Self. As It never ceases to exist, Its eternal immutability is self-evident and does not depend on any evidence; for *an object of Knowledge different from the* self-evident Knower depends on an evidence in order to be known. Other than the object the eternal Knowledge that is indispensable in proving non-conscious things different from Itself, is immutable; for It is always of a self-evident nature. Just as iron, water, etc., which are not of the nature of light and heat, depend for them on the sun, fire and other things other than themselves, but the sun and fire themselves, always of the nature of light and heat, do not depend for them on anything else; so, being of the nature of pure Knowledge It does not depend on an evidence to prove that It exists or that It is the Knower."

अनित्यत्वे एव प्रमा स्यात्, न नित्यत्वे इति चेत् ॥ १४ ॥

94. Disciple.—" But it is transitory knowledge only that is the result[1] of a proof and not eternal Knowledge."[2]

न । अवगतेः नित्यत्वानित्यत्वयोः विशेषानुपपत्तेः । न हि अवगतेः प्रमात्वे अनित्या अवगतिः प्रमा, न नित्या इति विशेषः अवगम्यते ॥ ९५ ॥

95. Teacher.—" No. There cannot reasonably be a distinction of perpetuity or otherwise in Knowledge. For it is not known that transitory Knowledge is the result of a proof and not eternal Knowledge, as Knowledge[3] Itself is such a result."

नित्यायां प्रमातुः अपेक्षाभावः । अनित्यायां तु यत्नान्तरितत्वात् अवगतिः अपेक्ष्यत इति विशेषः स्यादिति चेत् ॥ ९६ ॥

96. Disciple.—" But eternal Knowledge does not depend on a knower[4] while transitory knowledge does so as it is produced by an intervening effort. This is the difference."[5]

सिद्धा तर्हि आत्मनः प्रमातुः स्वतःसिद्धिः, प्रमाणनिरपेक्षतयैवेति ॥ ९७ ॥

97. Teacher.—" The Knower[6] which is the Self is then self-evident as It does not depend on any evidence (in order to be proved)."

1 True Knowledge is due to sense-perception, inference, testimony, etc., when we see a jar, for example, with our eyes, we have what is called the true Knowledge of the jar. It is produced and therefore transitory. That is what the disciple thinks.

2 Pure Knowledge which is the Self.

3 Pure Knowledge Itself. See paras 103 and 108 of this Chapter.

4 One who applies a proof.

5 Between Knowledge eternal and transitory.

6 Eternal Knowledge. See para 93 above.

अभावेऽपि अपेक्षाभावः, नित्यत्वात् इति चेत्। न। अवगतेरेव आत्मनि सद्भावादिति परिहृतमेतत् ॥ ९८ ॥

98. Disciple.—"(If the Knowledge of the Self be independent of an evidence on the ground that It is eternal) why should the absence [1] of the result [2] of an evidence with regard to the Self be not so on the same ground?"

Teacher.—"No, it has been refuted on the ground that it is pure Knowledge that is in the Self." [3]

प्रमातुश्चेत् प्रमाणापेक्षासिद्धिः, कस्य प्रमित्सा स्यात्? यस्य प्रमित्सा स एव प्रमाता अभ्युपगम्यते। तदीया च प्रमित्सा प्रमेयविषयैव, न प्रमातृविषया। प्रमातृविषयत्वे अनवस्थाप्रसङ्गात् प्रमातुः तदिच्छायाश्च, तस्याप्यन्यः प्रमाता, तस्याप्यन्य इति। एवमेव इच्छायाः प्रमातृविषयत्वे। प्रमातुरात्मनः अव्यवहितत्वाच्च प्रमेयत्वानुपपत्तिः। लोके हि प्रमेयं नाम प्रमातुः इच्छा-स्मृति प्रयत्न-प्रमाणजन्मव्यवहितं सिद्ध्यति, नान्यथा अवगतिः प्रमेयविषया दृष्टा। नच प्रमातुः प्रमाता स्वस्य स्वयमेव केनचित् व्यवहितः कल्पयितुं शक्यः इच्छादीनामन्यतमेनापि। स्मृतिश्च स्मर्तव्यविषया, न स्मर्तृविषया। तथा इच्छायाः इष्टविषयत्वमेव, न इच्छावद्विषयत्वम्। स्मर्त्रि-

[1] The disciple thinks that the Self does not exist as It is not known by an evidence. [2] True Knowledge. See foot-note 1, para 94 above. [3] i.e., the Self is of the nature of pure Knowledge and so It exists independent of every evidence. See paras 93 and 97 above.

च्छावद्विषयत्वेऽपि हि उभयोः अनवस्था पूर्ववदपरिहार्या स्यात् ॥ ९९ ॥

99. "Whom will the desire (to know a thing) belong to if the Knower depends on an evidence in order to be known? It is admitted that one who is desirous of knowing a thing is the Knower. His desire of knowing a thing has for its object the thing to be known and not the Knower. For, in the latter case, there arises a *regressus ad infinitum* with regard to the Knower and also with regard to the desire to know the Knower inasmuch as the knower of the knower and so on (are to be known); and such is the case with regard to the desire of knowing the knower. Moreover, there being nothing intervening, the Knower, the Self cannot fall into the category of the known. For a thing to be known[1] becomes known when it is distanced from the knower by the birth of an intervening desire, memory, effort or an evidence on the part of the knower. There cannot be the knowledge of an object in any other way. Again it cannot be imagined that the knower himself is distanced from himself by anyone of his own desire etc. For memory has for its object the thing to be remembered and not one who remembers it; so has desire for its object the thing to be desired and not one who desires it. There arises, as before, an inevitable *regressus ad infinitum*

[1] i.e., a thing to be known is distanced by the birth of an evidence before it is known; a thing to be desired is distanced by the birth of a desire before it is desired; a thing to be remembered is distanced by the birth of a memory before it is remembered; and a thing to be accomplished is distanced by an effort before it is accomplished.

if memory and desire have their own agents for their objects.

ननु प्रमातृविषयावगत्यनुत्पत्तौ अनवगत एव प्रमाता स्यादिति चेत् ॥ १०० ॥

100. Disciple.—" But the Knower remains unknown if there is no knowledge which has for its object the Knower."

न, अवगन्तुः अवगतेः अवगन्तव्यविषयत्वात् । अवगन्तृविषयत्वे च अनवस्था पूर्ववत् स्यात् । अवगतिश्च आत्मनि कूटस्थनित्यात्मज्योतिः अन्यतः अनपेक्षैव सिद्धा, अग्न्यादित्याद्युष्णप्रकाशवत्, इति पूर्वमेव प्रसाधितम् । अवगतेः चैतन्यात्मज्योतिषः स्वात्मनि अनित्यत्वे आत्मनः स्वार्थतानुपपत्तिः, कार्यकारणसंघातवत् संहतत्वात् पारार्थ्यं दोषवत्त्वं च अवोचाम । कथम्? चैनन्यात्मज्योतिषः स्वात्मनि अनित्यत्वे स्मृत्यादिव्यवधानात् सान्तरत्वम् । ततश्च तस्य चैतन्यज्योतिषः प्रागुत्पत्तेः प्रध्वंसाच्चोर्ध्वं आत्मन्येव अभावात्, चक्षुरादीनामिव संहतत्वात्, पारार्थ्यं स्यात् । यदा च तत् उत्पन्नं आत्मनि विद्यते, न तदा आत्मनः स्वार्थत्वम् । तद्भावाभावापेक्षा हि आत्मानात्मनोः स्वार्थत्वपरार्थत्वसिद्धिः । तस्मात् आत्मनः अन्यनिरपेक्षमेव नित्यचैतन्यज्योतिष्ट्वं सिद्धम् ॥ १०१ ॥

101. Teacher.—" No. The knowledge of the knower has for its object the thing to be known. If it have for its object the knower there arises a *regressus ad infinitum*

as before.[1] It has already [2] been shown that, like the heat and light of the sun, fire and other things, the Knowledge which is changeless, eternal and self-effulgent [3] has an existence in the Self entirely independent of everything else. I have already [4] said that, if the self-effulgent Knowledge which is there in the Self were transitory,[5] it would become unreasonable that the Self existed for Itself, and, being a combination, It would get impurities and have an existence for the sake of another like the combination of the body and the senses. How ? (Reply) If the self-effulgent Knowledge in the Self were transitory It would have a distance [6] by the intervention of memory etc. It would then be non-existent in the Self before being produced and after being destroyed, and the Self, then a combination, would have an existence for the sake of another like that of the eye etc. produced by the combination of certain things. The Self would have no independent existence if this Knowledge were produced before it was in It. For it is only on account of the absence or presence of the state of being combined that the Self is known to exist for Itself and the non-Self for another. It is, therefore, established that the Self is of the nature of eternal and self-effulgent Knowledge not dependent on anything else."

ननु एवं सति, असति प्रमाश्रयत्वे कथं प्रमातुः प्रमातृत्वम् ॥ १०२ ॥

[1] See para 99 above.
[2] See para 93 above.
[3] Br. U., 4. 3. 9.
[4] See paras 64 to 73.
[5] And therefore producible.
[6] See para 99.

102. Disciple.—"How can the Knower be a Knower if he is not the seat of the knowledge produced by evidences?"

उच्यते—प्रमायाः नित्यत्वे अनित्यत्वे च रूपविशेषाभावात्। अवगतिर्हि प्रमा। तस्याः स्मृतीच्छादिपूर्विकायाः अनित्यायाः, कूटस्थनित्याया वा, न स्वरूपविशेषो विद्यते। यथा धात्वर्थस्य तिष्ठत्यादेः फलस्य गत्यादिपूर्वकस्य अनित्यस्य अपूर्वस्य नित्यस्य वा, रूपविशेषो नास्तीति तुल्यो व्यपदेशो दृष्टः—तिष्ठन्ति मनुष्याः, तिष्ठन्ति पर्वताः इत्यादि, तथा नित्यावगतिस्वरूपेऽपि प्रमातरि प्रमातृत्वव्यपदेशो न विरुध्यते, फलसामान्यादिति॥ १०३॥

103. The teacher said, "The knowledge [1] produced by an evidence does not differ in its essential nature whether one calls it eternal or transitory. Knowledge (though) produced by an evidence is nothing but knowledge. The knowledge preceded [2] by memory, desire, etc. and supposed to be transitory, and that which is eternal and immutable do not differ in their essential nature. Just as the result of the transitory actions of standing etc., the meanings of roots, preceded by motion etc. and that of the permanent ones not so preceded do not differ in their essential nature, and there are, therefore, the identical predicates in the statements, 'People stand', 'Mountains stand', etc.; so, the Knower, though of the nature of eternal Knowledge,

[1] True knowledge as opposed to delusion, See note 1, para 94 above.
[2] See para 99 above.

is called a Knower without contradiction inasmuch as eternal Knowledge is the same [1] as one produced by an evidence (as regards Its essential nature)."

अत्राह शिष्यः—नित्यावगतिस्वरूपस्य आत्मनः अविक्रियत्वात् कार्यकरणैः असंहत्य, तक्षादीनामिव वास्यादिभिः, कर्तृत्वं नोपपद्यते, असंहतस्वभावस्य च कार्यकरणोपादाने अनवस्था प्रसज्येत। तक्षादीनां तु कार्यकरणैः नित्यमेव संहतत्वमिति वास्याद्युपादाने नानवस्था स्यादिति ॥ १०४ ॥

104. Here the disciple starts an objection : "It is not reasonable that the Self which is changeless and of the nature of eternal Knowledge and not in contact with the body and the senses should be the agent [2] of an action like a carpenter in contact with an adze and other instruments. A *regressus ad infinitum* arises if the Self unconnected with the body, the senses, etc. were to use them as Its instruments. As carpenters and others are always connected with bodies and senses there is no *regressus ad infinitum* when they use adzes and other instruments."

इह तु असंहतस्वभावस्य करणानुपादाने कर्तृत्वं नोपपद्यत इति करणं उपादेयम्, तदुपादानमपि विक्रियैवेति तत्कर्तृत्वे करणान्तरमुपादेयम, तदुपादानेऽपि अन्यदिति प्रमातुः स्वातन्त्र्ये अनवस्था अपरिहार्या स्यात् इति। न च क्रियैव आत्मानं कारयति, अनिर्वर्तितायाः स्वरूपाभावात्। अथ अन्यत् आत्मानं उपेत्य क्रियां कारयतीति चेत्। न। अन्यस्य स्वतःसिद्धत्वा-

[1] See para 108.

[2] Br. Sû., 2. 3. 33, 40.

विषयत्वाद्यनुपपत्तेः । न हि आत्मनः अन्यत् अचेतनं वस्तु स्वप्रमाणकं दृष्टम् । शब्दादिसर्वमेव अवगतिफलावसानप्रत्ययप्रमितं सिद्धं स्यात् । अवगतिश्चेदात्मनोऽन्यस्य स्यात्, सोऽपि आत्मैव असंहतः स्वार्थः स्यात्, न परार्थः । न च देहेन्द्रियविषयाणां स्वार्थतां अवगन्तुं शक्नुमः, अवगत्यवसानप्रत्ययापेक्षसिद्धिदर्शनात् ॥ १०५ ॥

105. Teacher.—(Reply) "Agency is not possible without the use of instruments. Instruments, therefore, have to be assumed. The assumption of instruments is, of course, an action. In order to be the agent of this action, other instruments have to be assumed. In assuming these instruments still others have to be assumed. A *regressus ad infinitum* is, therefore, inevitable if the Self which is not joined with anything were to be the agent.[1]

"Nor can it be said that it is an action [2] that makes the Self act. For an action, not performed, has no existence. It is also not possible that something (previously existing) makes the Self act as nothing (except the Self) can have an independent existence and be a non-object. For things other than the Self must be non-conscious and, therefore, are not seen to be Self-existent. All things including sound [3] etc. come to exist when they are proved by mental functions resulting in the reflection of the *Self*.

[1] Br. Sû., 2. 3. 33, 40. The Self is not really an agent but only apparently so. [2] As the Mîmâmsakas hold. [3] Sound, touch, sight, taste and smell.

"One,[1] (apparently) different from the Self, and possessed of consciousness, must be no other than the Self that is free from combination with other things and existing for Itself only.

"Nor[2] can we admit that the body, the senses and their objects exist for themselves inasmuch as they are seen to depend for their existence on mental modifications resulting in the reflection of the Self."

ननु देहस्यावगतौ न कश्चित् प्रत्यक्षादिप्रत्ययान्तरं अपेक्षते ॥ १०६ ॥

106. Disciple.—"But no one depends on any other evidence such as sense-perception etc. in knowing the body."

बाढं, जाग्रति एवं स्यात्। मृतिसुषुप्त्योस्तु देहस्यापि प्रत्यक्षादिप्रमाणापेक्षैव सिद्धिः। तथैव इन्द्रियाणाम्। बाह्या एव हि शब्दादयो देहेन्द्रियाकारपरिणता इति प्रत्यक्षादिप्रमाणापेक्षैव हि सिद्धिः। सिद्धिरिति च प्रमाणफलं अवगतिं अवोचाम, सा च अवगतिः कूटस्था स्वयंसिद्धात्मज्योतिःस्वरूपेति च ॥ १०७ ॥

107. Teacher.—"Yes, it is so in the waking state. But at death and in deep sleep the body also depends on evidences such as sense-perception etc. in order to be known. Similar is the case with the senses. It is the external sound and other objects that are transformed into the body and the senses; the latter, therefore,

[1] The Naiyâyikas hold that *Isvara* is different from the individual soul This view is refuted here. [2] It is the position of the Chârvâkas.

also depend on evidences like sense-perception etc. in order to be known. I have said that Knowledge,[1] the result produced by evidences, is the same[2] as the self-evident, self-effulgent and changeless Self. That is which I mean by knowledge."

अत्राह चोदकः—अवगतिः प्रमाणानां फलं, कूटस्थनित्यात्मज्योतिःस्वरूपेति च विप्रतिषिद्धम् । इत्युक्तवन्तमाह—न विप्रतिषिद्धम् । कथं तर्हि अवगतेः फलत्वम् ? कूटस्था नित्यापि सती प्रत्यक्षादिप्रत्ययान्ते लक्ष्यते, तादर्थ्यात् । प्रत्यक्षादिप्रत्ययस्य अनित्यत्वे अनित्येव भवति । तेन प्रमाणानां फलं इति उपचर्यते ॥ १०८ ॥

108. The objector (the disciple) says, "It is contradictory to state that Knowledge is the result of evidences and (at the same time) it is the self-effulgent Self which is changeless and eternal."

The reply given to him is this: "It is not a contradication."

"How then is knowledge a result?"

"(It is a result in a secondary sense:) though changeless and eternal, It is noticed in the presence of mental modifications called sense-perception etc. as they are instrumental in making It manifest. It appears to be transitory as mental modifications called sense-perception etc. are so. It is for this reason that It is called the result[3] of proofs in a secondary[4] sense."

[1] Knowledge, according to the Chârvâkas, is an effect produced in the body, a combination of the elements, like the effect of a chemical combination. [2] See paras 103 and 108. [3] See para 103 above. [4] The same pure Consciousness is thus called, in a secondary sense, a knower, an agent, or the result of proofs. This is the gist of the paragraphs from 94 onwards.

यद्येवं भगवन्, कूटस्थनित्यावगतिः आत्मज्योतिःस्वरूपैव स्वयंसिद्धा, आत्मनि प्रमाणनिरपेक्षत्वात्, ततोऽन्यत् अचेतनं संहत्यकारित्वात् परार्थम्। येन च सुखदुःखमोहप्रत्ययावगतिरूपेण पारार्थ्यं, तेनैव स्वरूपेण अनात्मनः अस्तित्वं, नान्येन रूपान्तरेण, अतो नास्तित्वमेव परमार्थतः। यथा हि लोके रज्जुसर्पमरीच्युदकादीनां तदवगतिव्यतिरेकेण अभावो दृष्टः, एवं जाग्रत्स्वप्नद्वैतभावस्यापि तदवगतिव्यतिरेकेण अभावो युक्तः। एवमेव परमार्थतः भगवन्, अवगतेः आत्मज्योतिषः नैरन्तर्यभावात् कूटस्थनित्यता, अद्वैतभावश्च सर्वप्रत्ययभेदेषु अव्यभिचारात्। प्रत्ययभेदास्तु अवगतिं व्यभिचरन्ति। यथा स्वप्ने नीलपीताद्याकारभेदरूपाः प्रत्ययाः तदवगतिं व्यभिचरन्तः परमार्थतो न सन्तीत्युच्यन्ते, एवं जाग्रत्यपि नीलपीतादिप्रत्ययभेदाः तामेवावगतिं व्यभिचरन्तः असत्यरूपा भवितुमर्हन्ति। तस्याश्चावगतेः अन्यः अवगन्ता नास्तीति न स्वेन स्वरूपेण स्वयं उपादातुं हातुं वा शक्यते, अन्यस्य च अभावात्॥ १०९॥

109. Disciple.—"Sir, if this is so, independent of evidences regarding Itself eternal and changeless Knowledge, the Consciousness of the Self, is surely self-evident, and, all things, different from It and therefore non-conscious, have an existence only for the sake of the Self as they combine to act for one another (in order that the events of the universe may continue uninterruptedly). It is only as the Knowledge[1] of the

[1] The substratum of the mental modifications by which they are known (illumined).

mental modifications giving rise to pleasure, pain and delusion that the non-Self serves the purpose of another.[1] And it is as the same Knowledge and nothing else that it has an existence.[2] So it does not really exist at all. Just as a rope-snake, the water in a mirage and such other things are found to be non-existent except only as the Knowledge by which they are known ; so, the duality experienced during waking and dream has reasonably no existence except as the Knowledge by which it is known. So, having a continuous[3] existence pure Consciousness, the Self, is eternal and immutable, and, never ceasing[3] to exist in any mental modification. It is one without a second. The modifications themselves cease to exist, the Self continuing to do so. Just as in dream the mental modifications appearing to be blue, yellow, etc. are said to be really non-existent as they cease to exist while the Knowledge by which they are known has an uninterrupted continuous existence ; so, in the waking state also they are reasonably really non-existent as they cease to exist while the very same Knowledge continues to do so. As that Knowledge[4] has no[5] other knower it cannot be accepted or rejected by Itself. As there is nothing else (except Myself the aim of my life is fulfilled by your grace)."

[1] Consciousness, the Self. [2] The non-Self has no existence independent of knowledge unlike that of Prakriti (the material cause of the universe) spoken of in the Sânkhya philosophy.

[3] In all experiences such as ' jar consciousness ', ' cloth consciousness ', etc., consciousness persists and is therefore real while jar, cloth, etc. do no persist and so are unreal. [4] The Self.

[5] Because It is Self-evident.

तथैवेति । एषा अविद्या, यन्निमित्तः संसारो जाग्रत्स्वप्नलक्षणः । तस्या अविद्यायाः विद्या निवर्तिका । इत्येवं त्वं अभयं प्राप्तोऽसि । नातःपरं जाग्रत्स्वप्नदुःखमनुभविष्यसि, संसारदुःखान्मुक्तोऽसीति ॥ ११० ॥

110. Teacher.—" It is exactly so. It is Ignorance [1] due to which the transmigratory existence consisting of waking and dream is experienced. It is Knowledge that brings this Ignorance to an end. You have thus attained Fearlessness.[2] You will never again feel [3] pain in waking or in dream. You are liberated from the misery of this transmigratory existence."

ओमिति [4] ॥ १११ ॥

111. Disciple.—" Yes, Sir."

[1] See para 49 of this chapter. [2] *Brahman*. Br. U., 4. 2. 4.
[3] See para 48 above and foot-note.
[4] This word, not translated, indicates that the chapter is at an end.

परिसंख्यानप्रकरणम् ॥ ३ ॥

CHAPTER III

REITERATION AND REFLECTION[1]

मुमुक्षूणां उपात्तपुण्यापुण्यक्षपणपराणां अपूर्वानुपचयार्थिनां परिसंख्यानमिदमुच्यते । अविद्याहेतवो दोषा: वाङ्मन:काय-प्रवृत्तिहेतव:, प्रवृत्तेश्च इष्टानिष्टमिश्रफलानि कर्माणि उपचीयन्ते, इति तन्मोक्षार्थम् ॥ ११२ ॥

112. This method of repetition is described for those who aspire after supreme tranquillity of the mind by destroying accumulatad sins and virtues and refraining from accumulating new ones. Ignorance causes defects.[2] Defects produce efforts of the body, mind and speech. And through these efforts are accumulated actions having desirable, undesirable and mixed results. (This method is described here) so that there may be a cessation of all these.

तत्र शब्दस्पर्शरूपरसगन्धानां विषयाणां श्रोत्रादिग्राह्यत्वात् स्वात्मनि परेषु वा विज्ञानाभाव:, तेषामेव परिणतानां यथा

[1] See Sankaracharya's Vâkyavritti 49.
[2] Desire and aversion.

लोष्टादीनाम्। श्रोत्रादिद्वारैश्च ज्ञायन्ते। येन च ज्ञायन्ते सः ज्ञातृत्वात् अतज्जातीयः। ते हि शब्दादयः अन्योन्यसंसर्गित्वात् जन्मवृद्धिविपरिणामापक्षयनाशसंयोगवियोगाविर्भावतिरोभावविकारविकारिक्षेत्रबीजाद्यनेकधर्माणः, सामान्येन च सुखदुःखाद्यनेककर्माणः। तद्विज्ञातृत्वादेव तद्विज्ञाता सर्वशब्दादिधर्मविलक्षणः॥ ११३॥

113. As they are perceived by the ear and the other senses the objects called sound, touch, sight, taste and smell have no knowledge of themselves or of other things. Transformed (into the body and other things) they, like brickbats, are (known to lack in the said knowledge). Moreover, they are known through the ear etc. Being the knower that by which they are known is quite of a different nature. For, connected with one another those sound and other objects are possessed of various properties such as, birth, growth, change of condition, decline, death, contact, separation, appearance, disappearance, cause, effect and sex. All of them produce various effects like pleasure, pain and so on. The knower[1] of sound and the like is of a nature different from theirs as It is the knower.

तत्र शब्दादिभिः उपलभ्यमानैः पीड्यमानो विद्वान् एवं परिसंचक्षीत॥ ११४॥

शब्दस्तु ध्वनिसामान्यमात्रेण, विशेषधर्मैर्वा षड्जादिभिः, प्रियैः स्तुत्यादिभिः इष्टैः, अनिष्टैश्च असत्यबीभत्सपरिभवाक्रो-

[1] The Self.

शादिभिर्वचनैः, मां दृक्स्वभावं असंसर्गिणं अविक्रियं अचलं अनिधनं अभयं अत्यन्तसूक्ष्मं अविषयं गोचरीकृत्य स्प्रष्टुं नैवार्हति असंसर्गित्वादेव माम्। अत एव न शब्दनिमित्ता हानिः वृद्धिर्वा। अतो मां किं करिष्यति स्तुतिनिन्दादिप्रियाप्रियत्वादिलक्षणः शब्दः। अविवेकिनं हि शब्दं आत्मत्वेन गतं प्रियः शब्दो वर्धयेत्, अप्रियश्च क्षपयेत्, अविवेकित्वात्। नतु मम विवेकिनो वालाग्रमात्रमपि कर्तुमुत्सहत इति। एवमेव स्पर्शसामान्येन, तद्विशेषैश्च शीतोष्णमृदुकर्कशादिज्वरोदरशूलादिलक्षणैश्च अप्रियैः, प्रियैश्च कैश्चित् शरीरसमवायिभिः बाह्यागन्तुकनिमित्तैश्च, न मम काचित् विक्रिया वृद्धिहानिलक्षणा अस्पर्शत्वात् क्रियते, व्योम्न इव मुष्टिघातादिभिः। तथा रूपसामान्येन, तद्विशेषैश्च प्रियाप्रियैः स्त्रीव्यञ्जनादिलक्षणैः, अरूपत्वात् न मम काचित् हानिः वृद्धिर्वा क्रियते। तथा रससामान्येन, तद्विशेषैश्च प्रियाप्रियैः मधुराम्ललवणकटुतिक्तकषायैः मूढबुद्धिभिः परिगृहीतैः, अरसात्मकस्य मम न काचित् हानिः वृद्धिर्वा क्रियते। तथा गन्धसामान्येन, तद्विशेषैः प्रियाप्रियैः पुष्पाद्यनुलेपनादिलक्षणैः, अगन्धात्मकस्य न मम काचित् हानिः वृद्धिर्वा क्रियते। 'अशब्दमस्पर्शमरूपमव्ययं तथाऽरसं नित्यमगन्धवच्च यत्' इति श्रुतेः ॥ ११५ ॥

114, 115. Distressed by sound and other things experienced, the knower of *Brahman* will thus practise repetition :

"I who am of the nature of Consciousness, not attached to anything, changeless, immovable, imperishable, free from fear, extremely subtle and not an object,

cannot, for the very fact of my being not attached, be made an object and touched by sound in general or by its special forms such as, the notes of the gamut, praise, etc. which are pleasant and desirable, and also false, terrible, insulting and abusive words which are undesirable. So there is no loss or gain due to sound. Therefore what can sound, pleasant or unpleasant, consisting of praise or blame do to me? Pleasant or unpleasant sound regarded as belonging to the Self glorifies or injures an ignorant man on account of indiscrimination. But it cannot do even the slightest good or evil to me who am a man of knowledge. (These ideas should thus be repeated.)

"Similarly, no change consisting of gain or loss can be produced in me by touch in general or by its special forms such as fever, colic pain, etc., coldness, hotness, softness or roughness which are unpleasant. Again, pleasant touches connected with the body or brought into existence by external and adventitious causes can likewise produce no change in me inasmuch as I am beyond touch like the ether which, when struck with one's fist, does not meet with any change whatever.

"Likewise, as I am entirely unconnected with sight no good or harm is done to me by it either in its general form or in its special forms pleasant or unpleasant, such as, ugly sights.

"Similarly, Independent of taste I am not harmed or benefited by it either in its general form or in its special forms 'such as, sweetness, sourness, saltiness,

pungency, bitterness and astringency, though accepted as pleasant or unpleasant by the ignorant.

"Thus I who do not consist of smell cannot be harmed or benefited by it either in its general form or in its special forms such as, flowers, fragrant pastes, etc. considered to be pleasant or unpleasant. For the *Sruti*[1] says that I am one who am 'eternally devoid of sound, touch, sight, taste and smell'.

किंच य एव बाह्याः शब्दादयः ते शरीराकारेण संस्थिताः, तद्ग्राहकैश्च श्रोत्राद्याकारैः अन्तःकरणद्वयतद्विषयाकारेण च, अन्योन्यसंसर्गित्वात् संहतत्वाच्च सर्वक्रियासु । तत्र एवं सति विदुषो मम न कश्चित् शत्रुः मित्रं उदासीनो वा अस्ति । तत्र यदि कश्चित् मिथ्याज्ञानाभिमानेन प्रियं अप्रियं वा प्रयुयुक्षेत क्रियाफललक्षणं, तन्मृषैव प्रयुयुक्षते सः । तस्य अविषयत्वान्मम—'अव्यक्तोऽयमचिन्त्योऽयं' इति स्मृतेः । तथा सर्वेषां पञ्चानामपि भूतानां अविकार्यः, अविषयत्वात् । 'अच्छेद्योऽयमदाह्योऽयं' इति स्मृतेः । यापि शरीरेन्द्रियसंस्थानमात्रमुपलक्ष्य मद्भक्तानां विपरीतानां च क्रियाक्रियादिप्रयुयुक्षा, तज्जा च धर्माधर्मादिप्राप्तिः, सा तेषामेव, न तु मयि अजरे अमृते अभये, 'नैनं कृताकृते तपतः', 'न कर्मणा वर्धते नो कनीयान्', 'सबाह्याभ्यन्तरो ह्यजः', 'न लिप्यते लोकदुःखेन बाह्यः' इत्यादिश्रुतिस्मृतिभ्यः । अनात्मवस्तुनश्च असत्त्वात् इति परमो हेतुः । आत्मनश्च अद्वयत्वविषयाणि, द्वयस्यासत्त्वात्, यानि सर्वाणि उपनिषद्वाक्यानि, विस्तरशः समीक्षितव्यानि समीक्षितव्यानीति ॥ ११६ ॥

[1] Kath. U., 3. 15.

116. "Moreover, sound and the other external objects transformed into the forms of the body, the ear and the other senses through which they are perceived, are transformed into the forms of the two internal organs, (the intellect and the mind), and also into those of their objects.[1] For they are connected and combined with one another in all actions. When this is so, I who am a man of knowledge have no one belonging to me as a friend or a foe nor have I anyone indifferent belonging to me. Anybody, therefore, who wishes to connect me with pleasure or pain, the results of his action, through a false egoism, makes a vain effort. For I am not within the reach of pain or pleasure as the *Sruti*[2] says 'It is unmanifested and inscrutable'. Similarly, I am not changeable by the action of any of the five elements as I am not of an objective nature. Therefore the *Sruti*[3] says 'It cannot be cut or burnt'. The merit or demerit arising out of good or evil done to this combination of the body and the senses on the part of those devotional or adverse to me will be theirs, but will not touch me who am devoid of old age, death and fear as the *Sruti* and *Smritis* say 'It[4] is not pained by omission or commission', 'It[5] is not harmed or benefited by any action', 'Unborn,[6] comprising the interior and exterior' and 'It[7] is beyond the pain felt by the people, and unattached'. The supreme reason (why I am unattached) is that nothing really exists except the Self".

[1] Pleasure, pain, etc. [2] Bh. Gîtâ, 2. 25. [3] Bh. Gitâ, 2. 24.
[4] Br. U., 4. 4. 22. [5] Br. U., 4. 4. 23. [6] Mu. U., 2. 1. 2.
[7] Kath. U., 5. 11.

As duality does not exist the portions of the *Upanishats* regarding the *oneness* of the Self should be studied to a great extent.[1]

Here ends the prose portion of *A Thousand Teachings* written by the all-knowing Sankara.

[1] The repetition of the last word in the text shows that the prose portion of the book is concluded.

पद्यबन्धः द्वितीयो भागः

Part II (Metrical)

उपोद्घातप्रकरणम् ॥ १ ॥

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

चैतन्यं सर्वगं सर्वं सर्वभूतगुहाशयम् ।
यत्सर्वविषयातीतं तस्मै सर्वविदे नमः ॥ १ ॥

1. I bow down to that all-knowing[1] One which is pure Consciousness, all-pervading,[2] all,[3] residing in the hearts[4] of all beings and beyond all objects[5] of knowledge.

समापय्य क्रियाः सर्वा दाराग्न्याधानपूर्विकाः ।
ब्रह्मविद्यामथेदानीं वक्तुं वेदः प्रचक्रमे ॥ २ ॥

[1] *Brahman*, the all comprehensive Principle. It, like the sun, illumines everything without being an agent.

[2] Just as a rope pervades the snake in a rope-snake.

[3] Because It is the material cause of everything.

[4] The Sanskrit word literally means a cave. Here it stands for the intellect of which the Self is the witness.

[5] Primeval Ignorance and all its modifications.

2. Now[1] then[2] the *Vedas* begin to describe the knowledge of *Brahman* after dealing with all actions[3] preceded by marriage and the installation of sacred fire.[4]

कर्माणि देहयोगार्थं देहयोगे प्रियाप्रिये ।
ध्रुवे स्यातां ततो रागो द्वेषश्चैव ततः क्रियाः ॥ ३ ॥
धर्माधर्मौ ततोऽज्ञस्य देहयोगस्तथा पुनः ।
एवं नित्यप्रवृत्तोऽयं संसारश्चक्रवद्भृशम् ॥ ४ ॥

3, 4. Actions, (both enjoined and prohibited), bring about one's connection with the body ; when the connection with the body has taken place pleasure[5] and pain[5] most surely follow ; thence come attraction and repulsion, from them actions[6] follow again, as the results of which merit and demerit appertain to an ignorant[7] man, which again are similarly followed by the connection with the body. This transmigratory existence is thus going on continually for ever like a wheel.

अज्ञानं तस्य मूलं स्यादिति तद्धानमिष्यते ।
ब्रह्मविद्यात आरब्धा ततो निःश्रेयसं भवेत् ॥ ५ ॥

[1] In the knowledge portion of the *Vedas* (for the benefit of seekers after liberation).

[2] After one has acquired the qualifications such as, self-control etc., in order to be able to gain the knowledge of *Brahman.*

[3] Both enjoined and prohibited.

[4] Sacred fire is established at the time of marriage. It burns continuously throughout one's life and with it one's body is burnt at death.

[5] The effects of merit and demerit. The Bliss of *Brahman* is not such an effect.

[6] All efforts of the body, mind and speech.

[7] One who was not got the knowledge of *Brahman.*

5. The cessation[1] of Ignorance[2] is desirable as it is the root of this transmigratory existence. Hence a delineation of the knowledge of *Brahman* through which comes liberation (from Ignorance) is commenced.[3]

विद्यैवाज्ञानहानाय न कर्माप्रतिकूलतः ।
नाज्ञानस्याप्रहाणे हि रागद्वेषक्षयो भवेत् ॥ ६ ॥
रागद्वेषक्षयाभावे कर्म दोषोद्भवं ध्रुवम् ।
तस्मान्निःश्रेयसार्थाय विद्यैवात्र विधीयते ॥ ७ ॥

6, 7. Not being incompatible with Ignorance actions do not destroy it ; it is knowledge alone that does it. Ignorance not being destroyed, the destruction of desire and aversion is not possible. Actions[4] caused by impurities[5] are sure to follow in case desire and aversion are not removed. Knowledge alone, therefore, is taught here[6] so that liberation (from Ignorance) may be accomplished.

ननु कर्म तथा नित्यं कर्तव्यं जीवने सति ।
विद्यायाः सहकारित्वं मोक्षं प्रति हि तद् व्रजेत् ॥ ८ ॥

8. (Objection) Obligatory duties should be performed (along with the practice of knowledge) as long as life lasts,[7] because these duties co-operate with Knowledge in producing liberation.[8]

[1] Just as a snake ceases to exist immediately on one's having the knowledge of the rope in a rope-snake. [2] Primeval Ignorance veiling *Brahman*. [3] In the *Upanishats*. [4] Efforts of the body, the mind and speech. [5] Desire, aversion and delusion. [6] In the *Upanishats*. [7] Ish. U., 2. [8] Objection, verses 8—11 (line 1).

यथा विद्या तथा कर्म चोदितत्वाविशेषतः ।
प्रत्यवायस्मृतेश्चैव कार्यं कर्म मुमुक्षुभिः ॥ ९ ॥

9. As they are equally enjoined[1] obligatory duties and knowledge (should be practised together). They should be undertaken by those who aspire after liberation because *Smritis*[2] speak of sins[3] also (arising out of the omission of those actions).

ननु ध्रुवफला विद्या नान्यत्किंचिदपेक्षते ।
नाग्निष्टोमो यथैवान्यद् ध्रुवकार्योऽप्यपेक्षते ॥ १० ॥
तथा ध्रुवफला विद्या कर्म नित्यमपेक्षते ।
इत्येवं केचिदिच्छन्ति न कर्म प्रतिकूलतः ॥ ११ ॥

10, 11 (first line). You may say "Followed by a sure result[4] Knowledge does not depend[5] on anything else." But it is not so. Just as *Agnishtoma*,[6] though followed by an unfailing result,[7] depends on things[8] other than itself ; so, knowledge, though bringing about a sure result, must depend[5] on obligatory duties.

11 (last line). (Reply). Some people hold this view. (We say :) No. As it is incompatible with actions Knowledge does not depend[9] on them (in producing its result).[10]

[1] Īsh. U., 11. [2] The whole body of the sacred tradition or what is remembered by human Teachers. [3] See Manu Samhitâ, 11, 44. [4] Liberation. [5] In order to produce liberation. [6] The name of a particular *Vedic* sacrifice. [7] Higher regions, where there is pleasure higher than in this world. [8] Accessories such as, chanting of certain *Vedic* hymns, reading of certain verses and the knowledge of certain gods. [9] Though it depends on actions for its own birth. [10] Liberation.

विद्यायाः प्रतिकूलं हि कर्म स्यात्साभिमानतः ।
निर्विकारात्मबुद्धिश्च विद्येतीह प्रकीर्तिता ॥ १२ ॥

12. Accompanied by egoism[1] actions are incompatible with Knowledge. For it is well-known here (in the *Vedântas*)[2] that Knowledge is the consciousness that the Self is changeless.[3]

अहं कर्ता ममेदं स्यादिति कर्म प्रवर्तते ।
वस्त्वधीना भवेद्विद्या कर्त्रधीनो भवेद्विधिः ॥ १३ ॥

13. Actions have their origin in the consciousness that one is a doer and has the desire of having the results of what one does. Knowledge depends on a thing, (its own object and also on evidence), while actions depend entirely on the performer.

कारकाण्युपमृद्नाति विद्या बुद्धिमिवोषरे ।
इति तत्सत्यमादाय कर्म कर्तुं व्यवस्यति ॥ १४ ॥

14. The Knowledge (of one's own real nature) destroys the ideas of doership etc.[4] (on the part of oneself like the right Knowledge of the nature of the desert which destroys) the conviction of there being water in it. When this is so how can (a man of Knowledge) accept[5] them as true and perform actions ?

[1] E.g., 'I am a *Brâhmana*' etc. [2] Literally, the final portions of the *Vedas*. [3] I.e., *Brahman* Itself. So, a man of Knowledge can have nothing to do with agency of actions.

[4] All the grammatical cases are meant.

[5] For without accepting them as true actions are not possible.

विरुद्धत्वादतः शक्यं कर्म कर्तुं न विद्यया ।
सहैव विदुषा तस्मात्कर्म हेयं मुमुक्षुणा ॥ १५ ॥

15. It is, therefore, not possible on the part of a man of Knowledge to have Knowledge and perform an action at the same time as they are incompatible with each other. So, one who aspires after liberation should renounce actions.[1]

देहाद्यैरविशेषेण देहिनो ग्रहणं निजम् ।
प्राणिनां तदविद्योत्थं तावत्कर्मविधिर्भवेत् ॥ १६ ॥

16. The natural[2] conviction on the part of the people that the Self is not different from the body etc.[3] arises through Ignorance. The *Vedic* injunctions (and prohibitions) are authoritative as long as it prevails.

नेतिनेतीति देहादीनपोह्यात्मावशेषितः ।
अविशेषात्मबोधार्थं तेनाविद्या निवर्तिता ॥ १७ ॥

17. The Self is left over by negating the body etc. by the *Sruti*,[4] 'Not this, not this,' so that one may have the Knowledge of the Self which is devoid of all attributes. Ignorance is brought to an end by this Knowledge.

निवृत्ता सा कथं भूयः प्रसूयेत प्रमाणतः ।
असत्येवाविशेषेऽपि प्रत्यगात्मनि केवले ॥ १८ ॥

[1] I.e., (1) those of which the results are desired, (2) which are prohibited, (3) that are obligatory and (4) those the performance of which becomes necessary on certain special occasions.

[2] I.e., not arising from the teachings of the *Sâstras*.

[3] I.e., the body, the senses, the mind, the intellect, vital force and their properties.

[4] Br. U., 2. 3. 6.

18. How[1] can Ignorance, once negated (by *Vedic* evidence), arise again ? For it is neither in the innermost Self which is only one[2] without a second and without attributes nor in the non-Self.[3]

न चेद्भूयः प्रसूयेत कर्ता भोक्तेति धीः कथम् ।
सदस्मीति च विज्ञाने तस्माद्विद्याऽसहायिका ॥ १९ ॥

19. How can there again be the idea[4] that one is a doer of actions and experiencer of their results if Ignorance does not arise after there has grown the Knowledge, 'I am *Brahman*' ? Knowledge, therefore, is independent of actions (in producing liberation).

अत्यरेचयदित्युक्तो न्यासः श्रुत्यात एव हि ।
कर्मभ्यो मानसान्तेभ्य एतावदिति वाजिनाम् ॥ २० ॥
अमृतत्वं श्रुतं यस्मात्त्याज्यं कर्म मुमुक्षुभिः ।
अग्निष्टोमवदित्युक्तं तत्रेदमभिधीयते ॥ २१ ॥

20, 21 (first line). Therefore, it is said by the *Sruti* that the renunciation of actions including mental ones (catalogued in the *Nârâyanopanishat*)[5] is superior to their performance. Again immortality is heard of in the *Brihadâranyakopanishat*[6] which says "This[7] alone." Hence they should be renounced by those who aspire after liberation.

[1] This verse is an answer to the objection that Ignorance, though negated, may prevail again. [2] So, the Self cannot cause Ignorance. [3] No category in the domain of the non-Self can cause Ignorance as all such categories are caused by it. [4] So, actions, naturally depending on this idea, become impossible then.
[5] Nâ. U. 78. [6] 4. 5. 15. [7] I. e., knowledge alone, independent of actions, is the cause of immortality (liberation).

21 (last line). We give the following reply[1] to the objector who quoted the example of *Agnishtoma*.[2]

नैककारकसाध्यत्वात्फलान्यत्वाच्च कर्मणः ।
विद्या तद्विपरीतातो दृष्टान्तो विषमो भवेत् ॥ २२ ॥

22. Knowledge is quite opposite in nature to that of actions like *Agnishtoma* etc. for they are accomplished with the help of many[3] materials and differ in the quality[4] of the result of each individual performance. The example, therefore, is not parallel.

कृष्यादिवत्फलार्थत्वादन्यकर्मोपबृंहणम् ।
अग्निष्टोमस्त्वपेक्षेत विद्यान्यत्किमपेक्षते ॥ २३ ॥

23. As it produces a result (variable in quality) the *Agnishtoma* sacrifice, like agriculture etc., requires subsidiary[5] actions[6] other than itself. But what else will Knowledge depend[7] on ?

प्रत्यवायस्तु तस्यैव यस्याहंकार इष्यते ।
अहंकारफलार्थित्वे विद्येते नात्मवेदिनः ॥ २४ ॥

24. It is only one having egoism[8] that may incur sin (by the omission[9] of duties). A man who has got Self-knowledge has neither egoism nor a desire for the results of actions.

[1] Verses 22 and 23. [2] See verse 10 above. [3] The performance of such an action becomes efficacious only when prescribed articles, '*mantras*' (*Vedic* formulae) etc., are used. [4] Chh. U., I. 1. 10. [5] Sea footnote 3, *sloka* 22. [6] So that the quality of the result might be better. [7] Because liberation, the result of Knowledge, does not vary in quality. [8] I. e., the idea that one is an agent and experiencer. [9] See verse 9 above.

तस्मादज्ञानहानाय संसारविनिवृत्तये ।
ब्रह्मविद्याविधानाय प्रारब्धोपनिषत्त्वियम् ॥ २५ ॥

25. The *Upanishats*[1] are, therefore,[2] commenced in order to teach the Knowledge of *Brahman* so that Ignorance might be removed and transmigratory existence might for ever come to an end.[3]

सदेरुपनिपूर्वस्य क्विपि चोपनिषद्भवेत् ।
मन्दीकरणभावाच्च गर्भादेः शातनात्तथा ॥ २६ ॥

26. The word '*Upanishat*' is derived from the root '*sad*'[4] prefixed by two particles, '*Upa*'[5] and '*ni*'[6] and followed by the suffix '*Kvip*'. So, that[7] which loosens the bondage of birth, (old age), etc., (enables a man to approach *Brahman*) and destroys birth, (death), etc., is called *Upanishat*.[8]

[1] *Upanishadic* texts are meant. [2] As independent of actions right knowledge produces liberation. [3] This verse states the main conclusion of the Chapter.

[4] This root has three meanings, (*a*) to slacken, (*b*) to move and (*c*) to destroy. [5] Near. [6] Certainly. [7] The Knowledge of *Brahman*. [8] In the primary sense, the books are so called in a secondary sense only.

प्रतिषेधप्रकरणम् ॥ २ ॥

CHAPTER II

NEGATION

प्रतिषेद्धुमशक्यत्वान्नेतिनेतीति शेषितम् ।
इदं नाहमिदं नाहमित्यद्धा प्रतिपद्यते ॥ १ ॥

1. Impossible[1] to be negated the Self is left over on the authority of the *Sruti*, 'Not this, not this.' So, the Self becomes clearly known on the reflection, 'I am not this, I am not this.'[2]

अहंधीरिदमात्मोत्था वाचारम्भणगोचरा ।
निषिद्धात्मोद्भवत्वात्सा न पुनर्मानतां व्रजेत् ॥ २ ॥

2. The consciousness of egoism (i.e., the mistaken identity of the Self with the body etc.) has its origin in the intellect[3] and has for its object what[4] is based on words[5] only. As its very nature and origin are both negated (by the *Sruti*, 'Not this, not this'), egoism[6] can never again[7] be regarded as founded on any evidence.

[1] For the Self is the witness of the process of negation itself.

[2] I.e., I am not the body, the senses, the mind, the intellect and the vital force. But I am the witness of all of them.

[3] The object portion in the consciousness 'I'. While using the word 'I' people mix up Pure Consciousness and the intellect. The intellect is the object portion of the consciousness 'I', Pure Consciousness is the non-object portion. [4] Name and form. [5] Chh. U., 6. 1. 4-6. [6] Though as old as time itself and experienced by beings birth after birth. [7] After the nature of the Self has been known.

पूर्वबुद्धिमबाधित्वा नोत्तरा जायते मतिः ।
दृगिरेकः स्वयं सिद्धः फलत्वात्स न बाध्यते ॥ ३ ॥

3. A following[1] knowledge does not arise without negating[2] the previous[3] one (e.g., the knowledge of the rope does not come without destroying that of the snake in a rope-snake). Pure Consciousness, the Self, only has an independent existence and is never negated as It is the result[4] of evidences.

इदं वनमतिक्रम्य शोकमोहादिदूषितम् ।
वनाद्गान्धारको यद्वत्स्वात्मानं प्रतिपद्यते ॥ ४ ॥

4. One attains one's own innermost[5] Self by crossing[6] the forest of this body infested with ferocious beasts of grief, delusion, etc., like the man[7] of the country of Gândhâra who crossed the forest and reached his own country.

[1] The right Knowledge of the substratum. [2] So, the Knowledge of the Self does not arise without destroying the previous Knowledge of egoism etc. [3] The superimposed Knowledge. [4] See paras 103 and 108 (Part I).

[5] It is the innermost because It is the substratum of the intellect, the mind, the vital force, the body, etc., each of which is supposed by the ignorant to be the Self. [6] By discriminating the body and the mind from the Self. [7] The story runs thus : This man, with his eyes covered and thrown in a deep forest far away from his own country, was very miserable and was crying loudly in order that the covering of his eyes might be removed, when a kind man did it and indicated the path to his country. The man then did reach his own country by remembering the instruction of the kind man. (Such is the case with the disciple and the teacher.) See Chh. U., 6. 14.

ईश्वरात्मप्रकरणम् ॥ ३ ॥

CHAPTER III

SELF-BRAHMAN

ईश्वरश्चेदनात्मा स्यान्नासावस्मीति धारयेत् ।
आत्मा चेदीश्वरोऽस्मीति विद्या साऽन्यनिवर्तिका ॥ १ ॥

1. The aspirant cannot know that he is *Brahman* if It be different from the Self. (It then contradicts the *Sruti.*) But if he has the conviction that he, the Self, is *Brahman* (there is no contradiction to the *Sruti*). This is (right) Knowledge which destroys Ignorance.[1]

आत्मनोऽन्यस्य चेद्धर्मा अस्थूलत्वादयो मताः ।
अज्ञेयत्वेऽस्य किं तैः स्यादात्मत्वे ह्यन्यधीह्नुतिः ॥ २ ॥

2. What would be the use (of the description by the *Sruti*) of the qualities, 'not[2] large' etc. if they were the qualities of one[3] other than the Self, it being not[4] an object of search ? But if Brahman (with these qualities) is the Self the ideas[5] such as, largeness, smallness, etc. are negated[6] from the latter.

[1] Which falsely shows that there are things other than the Self.
[2] Br. U., 3. 8. 8. [3] Personal God. [4] For it is other than the Self. See Br. U., 1. 4. 7. [5] Superimposed on the Self. [6] And thus liberation is achieved.

मिथ्याध्यासनिषेधार्थं ततोऽस्थूलादि गृह्यताम् ।
परत्र चेन्निषेधार्थं शून्यतावर्णनं हि तत् ॥ ३ ॥

3. Know, therefore, that the *Sruti*, 'not large' etc. is meant to negate the false superimposition (of largeness, smallness, etc. on the Self) as it would be a description of a void if it were meant to negate those qualities from one other than the Self.

बुभुत्सोर्यदि चान्यत्र प्रत्यगात्मन इष्यते ।
अप्राणो ह्यमनाः शुभ्र इति चानर्थकं वचः ॥ ४ ॥

4. Moreover, the saying,[1] 'devoid of the vital force, devoid of the mind and pure' would be unmeaning if these qualities were meant to be negated from one other[2] than the individual Self, the aspirant.

[1] Mu. U., 2. *1*. 2. [2] For the vital force and the mind are possessed by none other than the individual Self. It possesses them owing *to Ignorance which is removed by this negation.*

तत्त्वज्ञानस्वभावप्रकरणम् ॥ ४ ॥

CHAPTER IV

THE NATURE OF RIGHT KNOWLEDGE

अहंप्रत्ययबीजं यदहंप्रत्ययवत्स्थितम् ।
नाहंप्रत्ययवह्न्युष्टं कथं कर्म प्ररोहति ॥ १ ॥

1. How can those actions of which the root is egoism[1] and which are accumulated in the mind produce results when they are burnt[2] by the fire of non-egoism, (the right Knowledge that one is neither the doer of actions nor the experiencer of their results) ?

दृष्टवच्चेत्प्ररोहः स्यान्नान्यकर्मा स इष्यते ।
तन्निरोधे कथं तत्स्यात्पृच्छामो वस्तदुच्यताम् ॥ २ ॥

2. (The objector). Actions burnt by the fire of Knowledge may produce results like the seen ones (of the actions of a man of Knowledge). (Reply). No. They are due to another cause.[3] (The objector). I ask

[1] Identification of oneself with the gross and subtle bodies.

[2] Hence, actions accumulated in previous births are not obstacles to liberation when the Knowledge of *Brahman* arises.

[3] I.e., those actions of past lives which have given birth to the present body and have begun to produce results.

you how there can be actions[1] when egoism[2] is destroyed. Please answer.

देहाद्यारम्भसामर्थ्याज्ज्ञानं सद्विषयं त्वयि ।
अभिभूय फलं कुर्यात्कर्मान्ते ज्ञानमुद्भवेत् ॥ ३ ॥

3. (Reply). Such actions[3] produce their results by overpowering the Knowledge of *Brahman* in you, because they have the power of producing the body etc. Knowledge, however, becomes manifest when[4] the results of these actions come to an end.

आरब्धस्य फले ह्येते भोगो ज्ञानं च कर्मणः ।
अविरोधस्तयोर्युक्तो वैधर्म्यं चेतरस्य तु ॥ ४ ॥

4. As knowledge and the experiencing (of pain and pleasure) are both results of actions that have given rise to the present body and have begun to produce results it is reasonable that they are not incompatible with each other. But other kinds of actions[5] are different[6] in nature.

देहात्मज्ञानवज्ज्ञानं देहात्मज्ञानबाधकम् ।
आत्मन्येव भवेद्यस्य स नेच्छन्नपि मुच्यते ।
ततः सर्वमिदं सिद्धं प्रयोगोऽस्माभिरीरितः ॥ ५ ॥

[1] Even those actions that have begun to produce results.
[2] For egoism is the root of all actions. (See the previous verse.)
[3] See Footnote 3. Verse 2.
[4] They come to an end only when they are exhausted by being experienced and one gets absolutely disembodied freedom.
[5] (1) Actions accumulated in previous states of existence and (2) those that are done in this life after the realization of Knowledge.
[6] For Knowledge destroys accumulated actions and makes impotent those that are done in the present life after the attainment of Knowledge.

5. The Knowledge of one's identity with the pure Self that negates the (wrong) notion of the identity of the body and the Self sets a man free even against his will when it becomes as firm as the belief of the man that he is a human[1] being.

All[2] this, therefore, is established. And reasons have been already given by us.

[1] Identifying himself with the body.

[2] The compatibility of Knowledge with the actions that have begun to produce results and its incompatibility with other kinds of actions.

बुद्ध्यपराधप्रकरणम् ॥ ५ ॥

CHAPTER V

ERROR IN UNDERSTANDING

मूत्राशङ्को यथोदङ्को नाग्रहीदमृतं यथा ।
कर्मनाशभयाज्जन्तोरात्मज्ञानाग्रहस्तथा ॥ १ ॥

1. People do not receive Self-knowledge on account of the fear that their duties (according to their castes and orders of life) would be destroyed like Udanka[1] who did not accept (genuine) nectar which, he thought, was urine.

[That people do not like to receive Self-knowledge is due to their ignorance of the real nature of the Self and a wrong and false conception about It.]

बुद्धिस्थश्चलतीवात्मा ध्यायतीव च दृश्यते ।
नौगतस्य यथा वृक्षास्तद्वत्संसारविभ्रमः ॥ २ ॥

[1] This man practised much austerity in order to please Vishnu so that he might get nectar from him. Vishnu was pleased and sent Indra with a pot full of nectar to give it to Udanka. Indra wanted to deceive him and in the guise of a *Chandâla* he hung the pot containing nectar from his waist. The pot was hanging in such a way that urine would fall into it if Indra were to make water. When he appeared before Udanka in that fashion and offered him the nectar the latter thought the pot contained urine and refused to accept the nectar.

2. The Self seems to be moving when the intellect moves and It seems to be at rest when it is at rest on account of Its identification [1] with the intellect like trees appearing to move in the eyes of those who are in a moving boat. Similar is the misconception [2] about transmigratory existence.

नौस्थस्य प्रातिलोम्येन नगानां गमनं यथा ।
आत्मनः संसृतिस्तद्वद्ध्यायतीवेति हि श्रुतिः ॥ ३ ॥

3. Just as trees are thought to be moving in a direction opposite to that of a moving boat by a man in it, so, transmigratory existence is (wrongly) thought to belong to the Self (by a man who has identified himself with the intellect). For there is the passage in the *Sruti*, 'as [3] if at rest.'

चैतन्यप्रतिबिम्बेन व्याप्तो बोधो हि जायते ।
बुद्धेः शब्दादिभिर्भासस्तेन मोमुह्यते जगत् ॥ ४ ॥

4. The modifications of the intellect are pervaded by the reflection of Consciousness when they come to exist. So the Self appears to be identified with sound [4] etc. This is the reason why people are deluded.[5]

चैतन्यभास्यताहमस्तादर्थ्यं च तदस्य यत् ।
इदमंशप्रहाणेन परः सोऽनुभवो भवेत् ॥ ५ ॥

[1] Due to ignorance. [2] For people make the mistake of believing that transmigratory existence belongs to the Self instead of to the intellect. [3] Br. U., 4. 3. 7. [4] The objects of the modifications of the intellect i.e., the body etc. [5] For unable to distinguish between the Self and its reflection people attribute the properties of the intellect to the Self.

5. As it is the object of pure Consciousness and exists[1] for It (the ego[2] is not the Self). Pure Consciousness is the universal Self[3] when the object portion[4] is rejected.[5]

[1] For the agency and experience of the Self is due to the superimposition of the ego on It.

[2] See footnote 3, verse 2, Chapter 2.

[3] What appears to be the individual Self owing to the proximity of the ego before the attaiment of right knowledge is known to be no other than the universal Self when the discrimination of the Self from the ego has been accomplished.

[4] The object portion of the consciousness 'I', i.e., the ego.

[5] I.e., when the identification of the Self with the ego is known to be due to a wrong conception.

विशेषापोहप्रकरणम् ॥ ६ ॥

CHAPTER VI

NEGATION OF ATTRIBUTES

छित्त्वा त्यक्तेन हस्तेन स्वयं नात्मा विशिष्यते ।
तथा शिष्टेन सर्वेण येन येन विशेष्यते ॥ १ ॥

1. The Self Itself is not qualified by an arm which has been cut off and thrown away. Similarly, It is not qualified by any of the remaining things[1] by which It is (thought to be) qualified.[2]

तस्मात्त्यक्तेन हस्तेन तुल्यं सर्वं विशेषणम् ।
अनात्मत्वेन तस्माज्ज्ञो मुक्तः सर्वैर्विशेषणैः ॥ २ ॥

2. Therefore all the qualifications are similar to the arm (cut off and) thrown away as they are all non-Self.[3] So the Self is free from all qualifications.

विशेषणमिदं सर्वं साध्वलंकरणं यथा ।
अविद्याध्यासतः सर्वं ज्ञात आत्मन्यसद्भवेत् ॥ ३ ॥

[1] The gross and subtle bodies and their attributes.
[2] See verses 91-94, Ch. 18.
[3] For they are all superimposed on the Self.

3. It is reasonable that, like ornaments,[1] all these[2] are qualifications (of the Self) owing to superimposition through Ignorance. When the Self is known they prove to be unreal.

ज्ञातैवात्मा सदा ग्राह्यो ज्ञेयमुत्सृज्य केवलः ।
अहमित्यपि यद्ग्राह्यं व्यपेताङ्गसमं हि तत् ॥ ४ ॥

4. After rejecting the object portion[3] one should accept the Self as the knower[4] free from all qualifications. The ego,[5] the object portion, is also like the part of the body cut off.[6]

यावान्स्यादिदमंशो यः स स्वतोऽन्यो विशेषणम् ।
विशेषप्रक्षयो यत्र सिद्धो ज्ञश्चित्रगुर्यथा ॥ ५ ॥

5. The Self of which the whole of the object portion[7] is the qualification is different from it. Bereft of all qualifications It has an independent existence like that of a man[8] possessing a variegated cow.

इदमंशोऽहमित्यत्र त्याज्यो नात्मेति पण्डितैः ।
अहं ब्रह्मेति शिष्टांशो भूतपूर्वगतेर्भवेत् ॥ ६ ॥

6. As it is not the Self the object portion in the consciousness 'I' should be renounced[9] by the wise.

[1] Falsely appearing to be the qualifications of the wearer.
[2] See footnote 1, verse 1 above. [3] See foot note 7, verse 5.
[4] Pure Consciousness, the witness. [5] Though to the ignorant it appears to be Self. [6] See verse 1 of this Chapter.
[7] In the consciousness 'I'. [8] The man has an existence independent of the cow, so has the Self an existence independent of the ego etc., Its qualifications, It having no connection with them.
[9] See footnote 13, verse 2, Chapter 2.

As It was mixed with egoism[1] previously[2] the remaining[3] (non-object) portion is implied by the word 'I' in the sentence 'I am *Brahman*.'

[1] It is mixed with the Self, just as a snake may be said to be mixed with a rope in a rope-snake i.e., a rope mistaken for a snake.

[2] Just as a Military Captain is called a Captain even after he has retired, so, we call Pure Consciousness 'I', even after It has been discriminated from the ego.

[3] Pure Consciousness.

बुद्ध्यारूढप्रकरणम् ॥ ७ ॥

CHAPTER VII

KNOWLEDGE THROUGH THE INTELLECT

बुद्ध्यारूढं सदा सर्वं दृश्यते यत्र तत्र वा ।
मया तस्मात्परं ब्रह्म सर्वज्ञश्चास्मि सर्वगः ॥ १ ॥

1. I am the supreme *Brahman* all-knowing and all-pervading, as pervaded[1] by the intellect all things[2] in all conditions are always illumined by me.[3]

यथात्मबुद्धिचाराणां साक्षी तद्वत्परेष्वपि ।
नैवापोढुं न वादातुं शक्यस्तस्मात्परो ह्यहम् ॥ २ ॥

2. Just as I am the witness of all the objects of *my* intellect, so, I am that[4] of the objects of *other*

[1] For the word आरूढ in the Text see verse 156, Chap. 18.

[2] In waking or dream; either in this world or in the next; known either through the senses or inference or from the scriptures etc.

[3] Just as a lamp is different from the objects it illumines, so, I am different from all objects illumined by me, Pure Consciousness.

[4] Being witnessed difference cannot pertain to the witness. So there cannot be more than one witness.

intellects. I am not capable of being rejected[1] or accepted.[2] Therefore I am the supreme *Brahman.*

विकारित्वमशुद्धत्वं भौतिकत्वं न चात्मनः ।
अशेषबुद्धिसाक्षित्वाद् बुद्धिवच्चाल्पवेदना ॥ ३ ॥

3. As It is the witness of all intellects (and their modifications) the Self is not of limited knowledge like the intellects and has no change, impurity or material nature in It.

मणौ प्रकाश्यते यद्वद्रक्ताद्याकारतातपे ।
मयि संदृश्यते सर्वमातपेनेव तन्मया ॥ ४ ॥

4. Just as in the presence of sunlight colours such as red etc., (of flowers and other things) are manifested in a jewel,[3] so, all objects are seen (in the intellect[4]) in My Presence.[5] All things are, therefore, illumined by Me like sun-light.

बुद्धौ दृश्यं भवेद् बुद्धौ सत्यां नास्ति विपर्यये ।
द्रष्टा यस्मात्सदा द्रष्टा तस्माद् द्वैतं न विद्यते ॥ ५ ॥

5. Objects of knowledge exist in the intellect as long as it is there (in waking and dream) ; but they do not exist in the opposite case (i.e., when the intellect is

[1] None can say that the Self is not the witness or not at any place as It is All-knowing and All pervading.

[2] No one can make the Self an object of one's knowledge or bring It into existence by any action as It always exists.

[3] Crystal etc. [4] The intellect is not the illuminator.

[5] Changeless like sunlight.

[6] For there is no evidence that non-conscious things exist when unknown.

merged during deep sleep). The Knower is always[1] the knower. Duality has, therefore, no existence.

अविवेकात्पराभावं यथा बुद्धिरवैत्तथा ।
विवेकात्तु परादन्यः स्वयं चापि न विद्यते ॥ ६ ॥

6. The intellect[2] knew the non-existence of the supreme *Brahman* before the discrimination (between the Self and the non-Self). But after the discrimination there is no individual Self different from *Brahman* nor is there the intellect itself.

[1] For the Self never ceases to exist like the intellect, its modifications or the objects of knowledge. Therefore they must be unreal. But the Self which always exists must be real and pure.

[2] Here the intellect is spoken of as having delusion. For it is on account of the mutual superimposition of the Self and the intellect that all delusion arises. Otherwise the intellect itself could not be spoken of as deluded or otherwise as it is non-conscious.

मतिविलापनप्रकरणम् ॥ ८ ॥

CHAPTER VIII[1]

MERGING OF THE MIND

चितिस्वरूपे स्वत एव मे मते रसादियोगस्तव मोहकारितः ।
अतो न किंचित्तव चेष्टितेन मे फलं भवेत्सर्वविशेषहानतः ॥ १ ॥

1. The connection of enjoyment etc., with me, oh My mind, who am by nature Consciousness Itself is due to the delusion created by you. As I am free from all attributes there is no utility accruing to Me from your efforts.

विमुञ्च्य मायामयकार्यतामिह प्रशान्तिमायाह्यसदीहितात्सदा ।
अहं परंब्रह्म सदा विमुक्तवत्तथाजमेकं द्वयवर्जितं यतः ॥ २ ॥

2. Give up false attempts and come to rest in Me from constant vain efforts as I am always the supreme *Brahman* as if[2] free from bondage, unborn and devoid of duality.

[1] This and Chap. 19 may be studied together for comparison.
[2] For *Brahman* is never bound. So It cannot be called at any time liberated.

सदा च भूतेषु समोऽस्मि केवलो यथा च खं सर्वगमक्षरं शिवम् ।
निरन्तरं निष्कलमक्रियं परं ततो न मेऽस्तीह फलं तवेहितैः ॥ ३ ॥

3. The supreme *Brahman*, the same[1] in all beings and free from all attributes I am all-pervading like the ether, imperishable, auspicious, homogeneous, partless and actionless. I, therefore, have no benefit to be derived from your efforts.

अहं ममैको न तदन्यदिष्यते तथा न कस्याप्यहमस्म्यसंगतः ।
असङ्गरूपोऽहमतो न मे त्वया कृतेन कार्यं तव चाद्वयत्वतः ॥४॥

4. No one different from Me can belong to Me who am one only. Nor can I who am unattached belong to anybody. I have, therefore, no benefit to be derived from anything done by you. As you[2] are not other than Myself you can have no effort nor its results.

फले च हेतौ च जनो विषक्तवानिति प्रचिन्त्याहमतो विमोक्षणे ।
जनस्य संवादमिमं प्रक्लृप्तवान्स्वरूपतत्त्वार्थविबोधकारणम् ॥५॥

5. Considering that people are attached to the ideas of cause and effect,[3] I have composed this dialogue (between the mind and the Self) leading to the understanding of the real nature of the Self in order that they might get freed from this (bondage).

संवादमेतं यदि चिन्तयेन्नरो विमुच्यतेऽज्ञानमहाभयागमात् ।
विमुक्तकामश्च तथा जनः सदा चरत्यशोकः सम आत्मवित्सुखी ॥

[1] Because the Self of all. [2] You are non-conscious and have no separate existence from *Brahman*. [3] G. K., 4. 14-28.

6. A man gets liberated from Ignorance, the cause of great fear,[1] and roams (over the world) free from desires, free from grief, a Knower of the Self, the same[2] in all beings and happy if he ponders over this dialogue.

[1] I.e., of this transmigratory existence.
[2] Because the Self of all.

सूक्ष्मताव्यापिताप्रकरणम् ॥ ९ ॥

CHAPTER IX

SUBTLENESS AND PERVASIVENESS

सूक्ष्मताव्यापिते ज्ञेये गन्धादेरुत्तरोत्तरम् ।
प्रत्यगात्मावसानेषु पूर्वपूर्वप्रहाणतः ॥ १ ॥

1. A succeeding one in the series of earth[1] etc. ending with the innermost Self is found to be subtler and more pervasive when a preceding one is negated.[2]

[When we negate a preceding one we get a subtler and more pervasive one till at last the innermost Self is reached which is of the nature of Existence and Consciousness and is the material[3] Cause of everything, and therefore, absolutely all-pervading and the subtlest.]

शारीरा पृथिवी तावद्यावद्बाह्या प्रमाणतः ।
अम्ब्वादीनि च तत्त्वानि तावज्ज्ञेयानि कृत्स्नशः ॥ २ ॥

2. External earth is the same as that pertaining to bodies. Water[4] etc., the other categories also are,

[1] Earth, water, fire, air and the ether.
[2] Known to have no separate existence from a suceeeding one, its cause. [3] See Br. Sû., 1. 4. 23. [4] External.

without exception, known to be the same [1] according to evidences.[2]

[When all the elements either external or pertaining to bodies are ascertained to be pervaded by the Self no distinction is known to exist between the external elements and those pertaining to bodies as the Self only then exists. See Br. Sû., 2. 1. 14.]

वाय्वादीनां यथोत्पत्तेः पूर्वं खं सर्वगं तथा ।
अहमेकः सदा सर्वश्चिन्मात्रः सर्वगोऽद्वयः ॥ ३ ॥

3. Always Pure Consciousness I am one without a second, all and all-pervading like the ether before the creation of air and other elements.

ब्रह्माद्याः स्थावरान्ता ये प्राणिनो मम पूः स्मृताः ।
कामक्रोधादयो दोषा जायेरन्मे कुतोऽन्यतः ॥ ४ ॥

4. It has been ascertained that all the beings from *Brahmâ*[3] down to the immovable creation are My bodies. From what other source will blemishes like lust, anger, etc. come into Me ?[4]

भूतदोषैः सदाऽस्पृष्टं सर्वभूतस्थमीश्वरम् ।
नीलं व्योम यथा बालो दुष्टं मां वीक्षते जनः ॥ ५ ॥

5. People look upon Me, the Lord[5] residing in all beings and always untouched by their defects, as tainted

[1] As those pertaining to the bodies. [2] Measure—Ram Tirtha.
[3] The soul invested with the aggregate of subtle bodies.
[4] They do not by nature belong to me as they come and go ; nor can they come to Me from anywhere else as there exists nothing else except Me. [5] I.e., the cause, and the cause is never touched by any of the properties of its effects.

(with those defects) like a boy who (erroneously) looks upon the sky as blue.

मच्चैतन्यावभास्यत्वात्सर्वप्राणिधियां सदा ।
पूर्मम प्राणिनः सर्वे सर्वज्ञस्य विपाप्मनः ॥ ६ ॥

6. As the intellects of all beings are illumined by My[1] Consciousness all beings are bodies belonging to Me who am all-knowing and free from all sins and virtues.

जनिमज्ज्ञानविज्ञेयं स्वप्नज्ञानवदिष्यते ।
नित्यं निर्विषयं ज्ञानं तस्माद् द्वैतं न विद्यते ॥ ७ ॥

7. Objects that come into being and are capable of being made the objects of Knowledge are as unreal as those known in dream. As duality has no (real) existence Knowledge is eternal and objectless.

ज्ञातुर्ज्ञातिर्हि नित्योक्ता सुषुप्ते त्वन्यशून्यतः ।
जाग्रज्ज्ञातिस्त्वविद्यातस्तद्ग्राह्यं चासदिष्यताम् ॥ ८ ॥

8. As there is nothing other than the Self in dreamless sleep it is said by the *Sruti*[2] that the Consciousness of the Knower[3] is eternal. (As Knowledge is really objectless) the knowledge of objects in the waking state must be due to Ignorance. Accept then that its objects are also unreal.[4]

[1] I.e., by Me Who am Pure Consciousness.

[2] Br. U., 4. 3. 23-30.

[3] Consciousness is the real nature of the knower like heat which is the nature of the sun.

[4] For the changeless Self cannot be the seat of knowledge nor can the non-conscious intellect. Therefore Knowledge in the waking state with its objects cannot but be falsely superimposed on the Self which alone is real.

रूपवत्त्वाद्यसत्त्वान्न दृष्ट्यादेः कर्मता यथा ।
एवं विज्ञानकर्मत्वं भूम्नो नास्तीति गम्यते ॥ ९ ॥

9. It is clearly understood that *Brahman* cannot be the object[1] of knowledge just as It cannot be the object[2] of seeing etc. as It has no colour, form and the like.

[1] It is said in the *Chhândogyopanishat* (7. 24. 1): 'Where one sees nothing else, knows nothing else it is Brahman', from which it might be inferred that one does not see or know anything else, it is true but one sees and knows the Self. The above verse is to remove this doubt. The Chh. text (7. 24. 1) prohibits in Brahman the duality appearing to be real during Ignorance.

[2] It is said in the *Brihadâranyakopanishat* (2. 4. 5): 'The Self should be seen, heard, reflected upon and meditated on.' So there may be a doubt that the Self is the object of seeing etc. The present verse is to remove this doubt. The Br. text (2. 4. 5) is really intended to make people turn away from the non-Self. It is not to teach them that the Self is object of seeing etc.

दृशिस्वरूपपरमार्थदर्शनप्रकरणम् ॥ १० ॥

CHAPTER X

RIGHT CONCEPTION OF THE NATURE OF CONSCIOUSNESS

दृशिस्वरूपं गगनोपमं परं सकृद्विभातं त्वजमेकमक्षरम् ।
अलेपकं सर्वगतं यदद्वयं तदेव चाहं सततं विमुक्तओ३म् ॥ १ ॥

1. I am the supreme *Brahman* which is pure consciousness, always clearly manifest, unborn, one only, imperishable, unattached and all-pervading like the ether and non-dual. I am, therefore, ever-free. Aum.[1]

दृशिस्तु शुद्धोऽहमविक्रियात्मको
न मेऽस्ति कश्चिद्विषयः स्वभावतः ।
पुरस्तिरश्चोर्ध्वमधश्च सर्वतः
संपूर्णभूमा त्वज आत्मनि स्थितः ॥ २ ॥

2. Pure and changeless consciousness I am by nature devoid of objects (to illumine). Unborn and established in the Self I am all-pervading *Brahman* in the front, oblique, upward, downward and all other directions.

[1] The Sanskrit word '*Aum*' used in the text indicates that one realizes *Brahman* by meditating on it. See *Kathopanishat* I. 2. 16, 17.

अजोऽमरश्चैव तथाऽजरोऽमृतः स्वयंप्रभः सर्वगतोऽहमद्वयः ।
न कारणं कार्यमतीव निर्मलः सदैकतृप्तश्च ततो विमुक्तॐ ॥ ३ ॥

3. I am unborn, deathless, devoid of old age, immortal, self-effulgent, all-pervading and non-dual. Perfectly pure, having neither cause nor effect and contented with the one Bliss [1] I am free. Yes.[2]

सुषुप्तजाग्रत्स्वपतश्च दर्शनं न मेऽस्ति किंचित्स्वमिवेह मोहनम् ।
स्वतश्च तेषां परतोऽप्यसत्त्वतस्तुरीय एवास्मि सदादृगद्वयः ॥४॥

4. No perception whatever in waking, dream or deep sleep belongs to Me but it is due to delusion. For these states have no independent existence nor an existence depending [3] on the Self. I am, therefore, the Fourth [4] which is the Seer of all the three states and without a second.

शरीरबुद्धीन्द्रियदुःखसंततिर्न मे न चाहं मम निर्विकारतः ।
असत्त्वहेतोश्च तथैव संततेरसत्त्वमस्याः स्वपतो हि दृश्यवत् ॥५॥

5. As I am changeless the series producing pain viz., the body, the intellect and the senses are not Myself nor Mine. Moreover they are unreal [5] like dream-objects, there being a reason for inference that they are so.

[1] I.e., the Bliss of the Self. [2] The word in the Text indicates assent. The disciple accepts Brahman as the Self.

[3] For they cannot have an existence dependent on the Self which is contrary to them in nature i.e., the Self is conscious while they are not so. [4] Fourth, because the Self is beyond the three states of waking, dream and deep sleep which are superimposed on It.

[5] The argument is this : the series is not real as they are objects of knowledge like dream-objects which are known to be unreal.

इदं तु सत्यं मम नास्ति विक्रिया विकारहेतुर्न हि मेऽद्वयत्वतः ।
न पुण्यपापे न च मोक्षबन्धने न चास्ति वर्णाश्रमताऽशरीरतः ॥ ६ ॥

6. But it is true that I have no change nor any cause of a change as I am without a second. As I do not possess a body I have neither sin nor virtue, neither bondage nor liberation, neither a caste nor an order of life.

अनादितो निर्गुणतो न कर्म मे फलं च तस्मात्परमोऽहमद्वयः ।
यथा नभः सर्वगतं न लिप्यते तथा ह्यहं देहगतोऽपि सूक्ष्मतः ॥ ७ ॥

7. Beginningless[1] and devoid of attributes I have neither actions nor their results. Therefore I am the supreme One without a second. Though in a body I do not get attached on account of My subtleness[2] like the ether which, though all-pervading, does not get tainted.

सदा च भूतेषु समोऽहमीश्वरः क्षराक्षराभ्यां परमो ह्यथोत्तमः ।
परात्मतत्त्वश्च तथाद्वयोऽपि सन्विपर्ययेणाभिमतस्त्वविद्यया ॥ ८ ॥

8. Though I am the Lord[3] always the same in all beings, beyond the perishable and the imperishable,[4] and therefore the Supreme, the Self of all, and without a second I am considered to be of a contrary nature on account of Ignorance.

[1] Bh. Gîtâ, 13. 31. [2] I.e., having no form. See Bh. Gîtâ, 13. 32.
[3] I.e., the cause. And therefore untouched by the defects of beings in whom I reside.
[4] The unmanifested Power of *Brahman* which transforms itself into the manifested universe. See Bh. Gîtâ, 15. 16-18.

अविद्यया भावनया च कर्मभि-
र्विविक्त आत्माऽव्यवधिः सुनिर्मळः ।
दृगादिशक्तिप्रचितोऽहमद्वयः
स्थितः स्वरूपे गगनं यथाऽचळम् ॥ ९ ॥

9. Not distanced[1] by anything from Itself and untouched by Ignorance, by false conceptions (of possessing a body etc.) and by actions the Self is very pure. Without a second and established in My real nature like the immovable ether I am (thought[2] to be) connected with the powers of seeing and other perceptions.

अहं परं ब्रह्म विनिश्चयात्मदृङ् न जायते भूय इति श्रुतेर्वचः ।
न चैव बीजे त्वसति प्रजायते फलं न जन्मास्ति ततो ह्यमोहता ॥ १० ॥

10. There is the saying of the *Sruti*[3] that one who has the sure conviction about oneself that one is *Brahman* is never born again. There being no[4] delusion, there is no birth. For, when the cause is not there there cannot be any effect.

ममेदमित्थं च तथेदमीदृशं तथाहमेवं न परो न वान्यथा ।
विमूढतैवं न जनस्य कल्पना सदा समे ब्रह्मणि चाद्वये शिवे ॥ ११ ॥

11. False conceptions of people such as, 'mine,' 'this,' 'thus,' 'this is so,' 'I am so,' 'another is not so,' etc., are all due to delusion. They are never in *Brahman* which is auspicious, the same in all and without a second.

[1] See footnote 1, p. 60.
[2] Through Ignorance.
[3] Kath. U., 1. 3. 8.
[4] For one has known the Self.

यद्द्वयं ज्ञानमतीव निर्मलं महात्मनां तत्र न शोकमोहता ।
तयोरभावे न हि कर्म जन्म वा भवेद्यं वेदविदां विनिश्चयः ॥ १२ ॥

12. All grief and delusion are removed from those great souls when there arises the very pure [1] knowledge of the non-dual Self. It is the conclusion of those who know the meaning of the *Vedas* that there cannot be any action or birth in the absence of grief [2] and delusion.[2]

सुषुप्तवज्जाग्रति यो न पश्यति द्वयं तु पश्यन्नपि चाद्वयत्वतः ।
तथा च कुर्वन्नपि निष्क्रियश्च यः स आत्मविन्नान्य इतीह निश्चयः ॥

13. It is the conclusion here (in the *Vedântas*) that one who, though perceiving [3] the world of duality in the waking state, does not,[4] as a man in deep sleep does not,[5] perceive it owing to duality being negated and who is (really) actionless even when (apparently) acting, is a man of Self-knowledge; but no one else is so.

इतीदमुक्तं परमार्थदर्शनं मया हि वेदान्तविनिश्चितं परम् ।
विमुच्यतेऽस्मिन्यदि निश्चितो भवेन्न लिप्यते व्योम इवेह कर्मभिः ॥

14. This Right knowledge described by me is the highest because it is ascertained in the *Vedântas*. One becomes liberated and unattached (to actions) like the ether if one is perfectly convinced of this Truth.

[1] I.e., free from all doubts. [2] Ignorance implied by them.
[3] Apparently. [4] I.e., does not perceive it to be real.
[5] Duality gets merged in Ignorance in the case of deep sleep but in the case of Self-knowledge it gets negated in all the states.

ईक्षितृत्वप्रकरणम् ॥ ११ ॥

CHAPTER XI

NATURE OF THE WITNESS

ईक्षितृत्वं स्वतःसिद्धं जन्तूनां च ततोऽन्यता ।
अज्ञानादित्यतोऽन्यत्वं सदसीति निवर्त्यते ॥ १ ॥

1. All beings are by nature pure Consciousness Itself. It is due to Ignorance that they apppear to be different from It. Their (apparent) difference from It is removed by the teaching 'Thou art Existence'.[1]

एतावद्ध्यमृतत्वं न किंचिदन्यत्सहायकम् ।
ज्ञानस्येति ब्रुवच्छास्त्रं सलिङ्गं कर्म बाधते ॥ २ ॥

2. The scriptures negate *Vedic* actions with their accessories[2] by saying 'Knowledge alone is the cause of immortality,[3] and that there is nothing else to co-operate with it (in producing liberation).'

सर्वेषां मनसो वृत्तमविशेषेण पश्यतः ।
तस्य मे निर्विकारस्य विशेषः स्यात्कथंचन ॥ ३ ॥

[1] *Brahman.* [2] The sacred tuft of hair on the head, the sacred thread, etc. [3] Br. U., 4. 5. 15.

मनोवृत्तं मनश्चैव स्वप्नवज्जाग्रतीक्षितुः ।
संप्रसादे द्वयासत्त्वाच्चिन्मात्रः सर्वगोऽव्ययः ॥ ४ ॥

3, 4. How can there be any special[1] property in Me who am changeless by nature and witness the modifications of the minds of all without any exception? (How can again there be any change in Me) who witness the mind and its functions in the waking state as in dream? But as there is the absence[2] of both the mind and its functions in deep sleep I am Pure Consciousness, all-pervading and changeless.

स्वप्नः सत्यो यथाऽऽबोधाद्देहात्मत्वं तथैव च ।
प्रत्यक्षादेः प्रमाणत्वं जाग्रत्स्यादात्मवेदनात् ॥ ५ ॥

5. Just as dreams appear to be true as long as one does not wake up, so, the identification of oneself with the body etc. and the authenticity of sense-perception and the like in the waking state continue as long as there is no Self-knowledge.

व्योमवत्सर्वभूतस्थो भूतदोषैर्विवर्जितः ।
साक्षी चेताऽगुणः शुद्धो ब्रह्मैवास्मीति केवलः ॥ ६ ॥

6. I am *Brahman* of the nature of pure Consciousness, without qualities, free from Ignorance, and free from the three states of waking, dream and deep sleep. Living in all beings like the ether I am the witness free from all their defects.

[1] E.g., agency, egoism, etc.
[2] Therefore witnessing the mind and its functions is not in the nature of the Self.

नामरूपक्रियाभ्योऽन्यो नित्यमुक्तस्वरूपवान् ।
अहमात्मा परं ब्रह्म चिन्मात्रोऽहं सदाद्वयः ॥ ७ ॥

7. Ever free and different from names, forms and actions I am the supreme *Brahman*, the Self, consisting of pure Consciousness and always without a second.

अहं ब्रह्मास्मि कर्ता च भोक्ता चास्मीति ये विदुः ।
ते नष्टा ज्ञानकर्मभ्यां नास्तिकाः स्युर्न संशयः ॥ ८ ॥

8. Those who think themselves to be one with *Brahman* and at the same time to be doers and experiencers should be regarded as fallen from both Knowledge and duties. They are, no doubt, unbelievers (in the *Vedas*).

धर्माधर्मफलैर्योग इष्टोऽदृष्टो यथात्मनः ।
शास्त्राद्ब्रह्मत्वमप्यस्य मोक्षो ज्ञानात्तथेष्यताम् ॥ ९ ॥

9. It must be accepted on the strength of the scriptures that the Self is *Brahman*, and that liberation accrues from Right Knowledge only, like the connection with the Self[1] of the results of sin and virtue, which, though unseen is admitted (on the same authority).

या माहारजनाद्यास्ता वासनाः स्वप्नदर्शिभिः ।
अनुभूयन्त एवेह ततोऽन्यः केवलो दृशिः ॥ १० ॥

10. What are called (in the *Sruti*[2]) clothes coloured with turmeric etc. are nothing but mental impressions

[1] The individual Self. [2] Br. U., 2. 3. 6.

perceived by people in dream. (The Self, their[1] illuminator, must, therefore, be different from them and from the subtle body in which they lie.) So the Self, pure Consciousness, (the perceiver of doership etc.,) must be different from them[2] (in the waking state also).

कोशादिव विनिष्कृष्टः कार्यकारणवर्जितः ।
यथासिर्दृश्यते स्वप्ने तद्वद्बोद्धा स्वयंप्रभः ॥ ११ ॥

11. Just as a sword taken out of its sheath is seen as it is, so, the Knower, the Self, is seen[3] in dream in Its real and self-effulgent nature free from cause[4] and effect.[4]

आपेषात्प्रतिबुद्धस्य ज्ञस्य स्वाभाविकं पदम् ।
उक्तं नेत्यादिवाक्येन कल्पितस्यापनेतृगा ॥ १२ ॥

12. The real nature[5] of the individual (Self) who was pushed and awakened[6] has been described by the saying, "Not this,[7] not this" which negates all superimposition.

महागाजादयो लोका मयि यद्वत्प्रकल्पिताः ।
स्वप्ने तद्वद्द्वयं विद्याद्रूपं वासनया सह ॥ १३ ॥

13. Just as objects of enjoyment like a great Kingship[8] etc. are superimposed on Me in dream (and are

[1] The Knower, Knowing and the Known in dream.
[2] I.e., from the subtle body and the impressions in it.
[3] Not as an object. [4] I.e., the mind which assumes the forms of causes and effects in dream. [5] *Brahman* Itself.
[6] Br. U., 2. 1. 15. [7] Br. U., 2. 3. 6. [8] Br. U., 2. 1. 18.

unreal[1]), so, the two forms,[2] (the visible and the invisible) with the mental impressions,[3] are also superimposed on Me (and are similarly unreal[4]).

देहलिङ्गात्मना कार्या वासनारूपिणा क्रियाः ।
नेतिनेत्यात्मरूपत्वान्न मे कार्या क्रिया क्वचित् ॥ १४ ॥

14. All actions are performed by the Self[5] which has identified Itself with the gross and the subtle bodies and which has the nature of accumulating[6] impressions. As I am of the nature[7] indicated by the *Sruti*, 'Not this, not this,' actions are nowhere[8] to be done by Me.

न ततोऽमृतताशास्ति कर्मणोऽज्ञानहेतुतः ।
मोक्षस्य ज्ञानहेतुत्वान्न तदन्यदपेक्षते ॥ १५ ॥

15. As actions have Ignorance for their cause there is no hope from them of immortality. As liberation is caused by right Knowledge (alone) it does not depend on anything else.[9]

अमृतं चाभयं नार्तं नेतीत्यात्मा प्रियो मम ।
विपरीतमतोऽन्यद्यत्त्यजेत्तत्सक्रियं ततः ॥ १६ ॥

16. But Immortality[10] is free[11] from fear and destruction. The individual Self (signified by the words)

[1] Br. U., 4. 3. 10. [2] Br. U., 2. 3. 1. [3] Br. U., 2. 3. 6
[4] For they are objects of Knowledge. [5] The individualized Self.
[6] Owing to continual performance of actions. As a matter of fact the subtle body is the seat of mental impressions.
[7] I.e., Pure Consciousness. [8] Neither in waking nor in dream; and also neither by nature nor by *Vedic* injunctions.
[9] Actions etc. [10] *Brahman*. [11] If it were not so it would be capable of being produced by actions.

'dear[1] to one' is *Brahman*[2] (devoid of all attributes) according to the *Sruti*, ''Not this, not this'. Whatever[3] is thought to be different from It[4] should, therefore, be renounced together with all actions.

[1] Br. U., 1. 4. 8 and 2. 4. 5.
[2] Therefore *Brahman*, not different from the Self, is not capable of being realized by actions.
[3] I.e., the ideas of 'me' and 'mine' with respect to it.
[4] *Brahman*.

प्रकाशप्रकरणम् ॥ १२ ॥

CHAPTER XII

LIGHT

प्रकाशस्थं यथा देहं सालोकमभिमन्यते ।
द्रष्टृभासं तथा चित्तं द्रष्टाहमिति मन्यते ॥ १ ॥

1. Just as a man (erroneously) looks upon his body placed in the sun as having the property of light in it, so, he looks upon the intellect pervaded by the reflection of Pure Consciousness as the Self, the witness.

यद्देव दृश्यते लोके तेनाभिन्नत्वमात्मनः ।
प्रपद्यते ततो मूढस्तेनात्मानं न विन्दति ॥ २ ॥

2. The Self gets identified with whatever[1] is seen in the world. It is for this reason that an ignorant man does not know himself (to be *Brahman*).

[The reason why people mistake the combination of the subtle and the gross bodies for the Self is this identification caused by Its reflection. On account of there being the reflection of Pure Consciousness in the body, the senses, the mind, the intellect and the vital

[1] The body, the senses, the mind, the intellect and the vital force.

force they appear to be conscious and cannot, therefore, be discriminated from the Self.]

दशमस्य नवात्मत्वप्रतिपत्तिवदात्मनः ।
दृश्येषु तद्वदेवायं मूढो लोको न चान्यथा ॥ ३ ॥

3. An ignorant man gets identified with objects[1] of knowledge and does not know the Self (which is different from them) like the tenth[2] boy who got identified as it were with the other nine.

त्वं कुरु त्वं तदेवेति प्रत्ययावेककालिकौ ।
एकनीडौ कथं स्यातां विरुद्धौ न्यायतो वद ॥ ४ ॥

4. Say how there can reasonably by the two contrary ideas, 'You do this' and 'You are *Brahman*'[3] at the same time and in respect of the same person.

देहाभिमानिनो दुःखं नादेहस्य स्वभावतः ।
स्वापवत्तत्प्रहाणाय तत्त्वमित्युच्यते दृशेः ॥ ५ ॥

5. Pain belongs to one identifying oneself with the body. One not identifying oneself with it, as in deep sleep, is, therefore, by nature free from pain. The teaching, 'Thou art That' is imparted in order that this identification[4] might be removed[5] from the Self.

[1] See foot-note, verse 2 above.

[2] After swimming across a river one of ten boys counted their number and found that they were only nine. The reason for this was that the boy did not count himself. He got, as it were, identified with the other nine and could not find that he was the tenth. But he came to know that he was the tenth when he was told so.

[3] Which is a non-doer. [4] Together with Ignorance, its cause.

[5] The unity of the Self and *Brahman* is here taught and not action.

दृशेश्छाया यदारूढा मुखच्छायेव दर्शने ।
पश्यंस्तं प्रत्ययं योगी दृष्ट आत्मेति मन्यते ॥ ६ ॥

6. An ignorant person[1] looks upon the intellect as the Self, when there is the reflection[2] of the Self in the intellect like that of a face in a mirror.

तं च मूढं च यद्वान्यं प्रत्ययं वेत्ति नो दृशेः ।
स एव योगिनां श्रेष्ठो नेतरः स्यान्न संशयः ॥ ७ ॥

7. He who looks upon the ego, the indiscrimination that produces delusion and other mental modifications (or the reflection of the Self in them) as having no connection with the Self, is, without doubt, the dearest to the knowers of *Brahman*. No one else is so.

विज्ञातेर्यस्तु विज्ञाता स त्वमित्युच्यते यतः ।
स स्यादनुभवस्तस्य ततोऽन्योऽनुभवो मृषा ॥ ८ ॥

8. As it is the Knower[3] of knowledge that is referred to by the word 'Thou' (in the *Sruti*[4]) the understanding of the term 'Thou' in this sense is correct. The other[5] sense different from it is due to superimposition.

दृशिरूपे सदानित्ये दर्शनादर्शने मयि ।
कथं स्यातां ततो नान्य इष्यतेऽनुभवस्ततः ॥ ९ ॥

[1] 'योगी' in the text.

[2] This is why one attributes the properties (e.g., agency, experiencing, etc.,) of the intellect to the Self like those (e.g., spots etc.) of the mirror to the face.

[3] Br. U., 3. 4. 2.

[4] Chh. U., 6. 8. 7.

[5] I.e., the Self with the intellect etc. superimposed on It.

9. How can there be knowledge or ignorance in Me who am eternal and always of the nature of Pure Consciousness ? No knowledge,[1] therefore, other than the Self[2] can be accepted.

यत्स्थस्तापो रवेर्देहे दृशेः स विषयो यथा ।
तत्त्वस्थस्तद्वदेवेह दृशेः स विषयस्तथा ॥ १० ॥

10. Just as the heat of the sun (in a part of the body) together with that part of the body is the object of the knower, so, pain and pleasure together with the intellect in which they lie are the objects of the Self.

प्रतिषिद्धेदमंशज्ञः खमिवैकरसोऽद्वयः ।
नित्यमुक्तः सदा शुद्धः सोऽहं ब्रह्मास्मि केवलः ॥ ११ ॥

11. I am *Brahman* without attributes, ever pure, ever free, non-dual, homogeneous like the ether and of the nature of Consciousness from which the object portion[3] has been negated.[4]

विज्ञातुर्नैव विज्ञाता परोऽन्यः संभवत्यतः ।
विज्ञाताहं परो मुक्तः सर्वभूतेषु सर्वदा ॥ १२ ॥

12. I am always the free[5] supreme Knower in all beings inasmuch as there cannot be a more comprehensive knower different from Me.

यो वेदालुप्तदृष्टित्वमात्मनोऽकर्तृतां तथा ।
ब्रह्मवित्त्वं तथा मुक्त्वा स आत्मज्ञो न चेतरः ॥ १३ ॥

[1] A mental modification with the reflection of Consciousness in it. [2] Pure Knowledge. [3] See foot-note 3, verse 2, Chapter II.
[4] On the authority of the Sruti, 'Not this, not this.'
[5] Because untouched by the properties of objects of knowledge.

13. He who Knows that the Consciousness of the Self never ceases to exist, and that It is never an agent and also gives up the egoism that he is a Knower[1] of *Brahman* is a (real) knower of the Self. Others are not so.

ज्ञातैवाहमविज्ञेयः शुद्धो मुक्तः सदेत्यपि ।
विवेकी प्रत्ययो बुद्धेर्दृश्यत्वान्नाशवान्यतः ॥ १४ ॥

14. Capable by no means of being known I am the knower and always free and pure as the discriminating knowledge[2] is in the intellect[3] and liable to be destroyed on account of its being an object of Knowledge.

अलुप्ता त्वात्मनो दृष्टिर्नोत्पाद्या कारकैर्यतः ।
दृश्यया चान्यया दृष्ट्या जन्यतास्याः प्रकल्पिता ॥ १५ ॥

15. The Consciousness[4] of the Self, on the other hand, never goes out of existence and is not capable of being produced by the action of agents etc. inasmuch as producibility is superimposed on It by another consciousness,[5] Its object and different from It.

देहात्मबुद्ध्यपेक्षत्वादात्मनः कर्तृता मृषा ।
नैव किंचित्करोमीति सत्या बुद्धिः प्रमाणजा ॥ १६ ॥

[1] The consciousness 'I am a knower of *Brahman*' is a modification of the mind and should not, therefore, be attributed to the Self. [2] The modification of the mind, 'I am *Brahman*.'
[3] And not in the Self. [4] The Self which is Consciousness.
[5] Phenomenal consciousness. It contributes its own producibility to the Self on account of superimposition.

16. The doership of the Self is false as it depends on the misconception of the body being the Self. That I do not do anything is the true knowledge which arises from the right evidence, (the *Vedas*).

कर्तृत्वं कारकापेक्षमकर्तृत्वं स्वभावतः ।
कर्ता भोक्तेति विज्ञानं मृषैवेति सुनिश्चितम् ॥ १७ ॥

17. Agency depends on doership, instruments[1] etc. but non-agency is natural. It has, therefore, been very well ascertained that the knowledge that one is a doer and experiencer is certainly false.

एवं शास्त्रानुमानाभ्यां स्वरूपेऽवगते सति ।
नियोज्योऽहमिति ह्येषा सत्या बुद्धिः कथं भवेत् ॥ १८ ॥

18. How can the idea that I am a person to be enjoined (by the *Vedas* to perform actions) be true when the real nature of the Self is thus[2] known from the scriptures[3] and inference ?[4]

यथा सर्वान्तरं व्योम व्योम्नोऽप्यभ्यन्तरो ह्यहम् ।
निर्विकारोऽचलः शुद्धोऽजरो मुक्तः सदाद्वयः ॥ १९ ॥

19. Just as the ether is in the interior[5] of all,[6] so, I am in the interior[7] even of the ether. Therefore I am without change, without motion, pure, devoid of old age, ever free and without a second.

[1] Of action and of knowledge.
[2] As described in this chapter. [3] See verse 8. [4] See verse 10 above.
[5] Being the material cause. [6] The other four elements. [7] I.e., I am the substratum of everything.

अचक्षुष्ट्वप्रकरणम् ॥ १३ ॥

CHAPTER XIII

EYELESSNESS

अचक्षुष्ट्वान्न दृष्टिर्मे तथाऽश्रोत्रस्य का श्रुतिः ।
अवाक्त्वान्न तु वक्तिः स्यादमनस्त्वान्मतिः कुतः ॥ १ ॥

1. There is no vision in Me as I am without the organ of seeing. How can there be hearing in Me who have no auditive organ ? Devoid of the organ of speech I have no action of speaking in Me. How can there be thinking in Me who have no mind ?

अप्राणस्य न कर्माणि बुद्ध्यभावे न वेदिता ।
विद्याविद्ये ततो न स्तश्चिन्मात्रज्योतिषो मम ॥ २ ॥
नित्यमुक्तस्य शुद्धस्य कूटस्थस्याविचालिनः ।
अमृतस्याक्षरस्यैवमशरीरस्य सर्वदा ॥ ३ ॥

2, 3. Devoid of the vital force I have no action (in Me), and devoid of the intellect I am not a knower. Ever free, ever pure, changeless, immovable, immortal, imperishable and bodiless I have no knowledge or ignorance in Me who am of the nature of the Light of Pure Consciousness only.

जिघत्सा वा पिपासा वा शोकमोहौ जरामृती ।
न विद्यन्तेऽशरीरत्वाद्व्योमवद्व्यापिनो मम ॥ ४ ॥

4. All-pervading like the ether I have no hunger, thirst, grief, delusion, old age or death as I am without a body (mind and vital force).

अस्पर्शत्वाच्च मे स्पृष्टिर्नाजिह्वत्वाद्रसज्ञता ।
नित्यविज्ञानरूपस्य ज्ञानाज्ञाने न मे सदा ॥ ५ ॥

5. Devoid of the organ of touch I have no act of touching ; and devoid of the tongue I have no sensation of taste. I never have knowledge or ignorance as I am of the nature of eternal Consciousness.

या तु स्यान्मानसी वृत्तिश्चाक्षुष्का रूपरञ्जना ।
नित्यमेवात्मनो दृष्ट्या नित्यया दृश्यते हि सा ॥ ६ ॥

6. It is well known that the mental modification,[1] produced through the instrumentality of the eye and of the form of the object of vision, is always witnessed by the eternal Consciousness of the Self.

तथान्येन्द्रिययुक्ता या वृत्तयो विषयाञ्जनाः ।
स्मृती रागादिरूपा च केवलान्तर्मनस्यपि ॥ ७ ॥
मानस्यस्तद्वदन्यस्य दृश्यन्ते स्वप्नवृत्तयः ।
द्रष्टुर्दृष्टिस्ततो नित्या शुद्धानन्ता च केवला ॥ ८ ॥

[1] In connection with an object the intellect gets transformed into the form of that object. This transformation is called a modification.

7, 8. Similarly, other mental modifications in the forms of objects of knowledge produced through the instrumentality of other organs and also those in the forms of memory, attachment, etc. existing only within the mind, and those[1] again in dream are witnessed by one different from all of them (i.e., by the Self). The Knowledge, therefore, of the Knower[2] is eternal, pure, infinite and without a second.

अनित्या साऽविशुद्धेति गृह्यतेऽत्राविवेकतः ।
सुखी दुःखी तथा चाहं दृश्ययोपाधिभूतया ॥ ९ ॥

9. It is through the indiscrimination between the Self and the modifications of the mind, Knowable adjuncts to the Self that the Knowledge of the Knower[3] is wrongly conceived by the people to be impure and transitory and the Self happy or miserable.

मूढया मूढ इत्येवं शुद्धया शुद्ध इत्यपि ।
मन्यते सर्वलोकोऽयं येन संसारमृच्छति ॥ १० ॥

10. All men misconceive themselves to be ignorant or pure according as they identify themselves with the mental modification, 'I am ignorant' or 'I am pure'. It is for this reason that they continue to be in transmigratory existence.

अचक्षुष्कादिशास्त्रोक्तं सबाह्याभ्यन्तरं त्वजम् ।
नित्यमुक्तमिहात्मानं मुमुक्षुश्चेत्सदा स्मरेत् ॥ ११ ॥

[1] These modifications do not assume the forms of external objects but of their impression only. [2] I.e., The Self which is Knowledge itself, just as by the heat of fire we mean the heat which is fire itself. [3] See footnote 2 on the two previous verses.

11. One should always remember the Self to be ever-free, unborn and comprising[1] the interior and exterior as described in the *Sruti* in which the Self is spoken of as 'eyeless'[2] and so on if one is an aspirant after liberation.

अचक्षुष्कादिशास्त्राच्च नेन्द्रियाणि सदा मम ।
अप्राणो ह्यमनाः शुभ्र इति चाथर्वणेर्वचः ॥ १२ ॥

12. That organs never belong to me is known from the *Sruti*, 'eyeless'[2] etc. There is again the saying of the *Sruti*[3] belonging to the *Atharva Veda* that the Self is 'devoid of the vital force, devoid of the mind and pure.'

शब्दादीनामभावश्च श्रूयते मम काठके ।
अप्राणो ह्यमना यस्मादविकारी सदा ह्यहम् ॥ १३ ॥

13. As I am always devoid[4] of the vital force and the mind and heard of in the *Kathopanishat*[5] as having no connection with sound etc. I am always changeless.

विक्षेपो नास्ति तस्मान्मे न समाधिस्ततो मम ।
विक्षेपो वा समाधिर्वा मनसः स्याद्विकारिणः ॥ १४ ॥

14. I, therefore, have neither unrestfulness nor a profound concentration. Both of them belong to the mind which is subject to change.

अमनस्कस्य शुद्धस्य कथं तत्स्याद् द्वयं मम ।
अमनस्त्वाविकारित्वे विदेहव्यापिनो मम ॥ १५ ॥

[1] See foot-note [2] verse 43, Chapter 17 and also see Mu. U., 2. 1. 2.
[2] Br. U., 3. 8. 8. [3] Mu. U., 2. 1. 2. (Thus both the Srutis prove the same thing.) [4] Mu. U., 2. 1. 2. [5] Kath. U., 1. 3. 15.

15. How can I who am pure and mindless have those two?[1] I am without any change and without a mind as I am all-pervading and devoid of a body.

इत्येतद्यावदज्ञानं तावत्कार्यं ममाभवत् ।
नित्यमुक्तस्य शुद्धस्य बुद्धस्य च सदा मम ॥ १६ ॥

16. So, I who am ever free, ever pure and ever awakened had duties[2] to perform so long as there was Ignorance.

समाधिर्वाऽसमाधिर्वा कार्यं चान्यत्कुतो भवेत् ।
मां हि ध्यात्वा च बुद्ध्वा च मन्यन्ते कृतकृत्यताम् ॥ १७ ॥

17. How can I have concentration, non-concentration or other actions in Me as all men feel that the acme of their lives is fulfilled when they meditate on Me and know Me?

अहं ब्रह्मास्मि सर्वोऽस्मि शुद्धो बुद्धोऽस्म्यतः सदा ।
अजः सर्वत एवाहमजरश्चाक्षयोऽमृतः ॥ १८ ॥

18. I am, therefore, *Brahman*, the all-comprehensive Principle, ever Pure, ever Awakened and ever Unborn, devoid of old age, imperishable and immortal.

मदन्यः सर्वभूतेषु बोद्धा कश्चिन्न विद्यते ।
कर्माध्यक्षश्च साक्षी च चेता नित्योऽगुणोऽद्वयः ॥ १९ ॥

19. There is no knower other than Myself among all the beings. I am the distributor[3] of the results of

[1] See the previous verse. [2] See the following verse.
[3] See Sankarânanda's gloss on Sw. U., 6. 11.

their actions and the witness. It is I to whom all beings owe their consciousness. Without qualities and without a second I am eternal.

न सच्चाहं न चासच्च नोभयं केवलः शिवः ।
न मे संध्या न रात्रिर्वा नाहर्वा सर्वदा दृशेः ॥ २० ॥

20. I am not the three[1] visible elements nor the two[2] invisible ones, neither am I both (i.e., their combination, the body). I am devoid of all attributes and the three *Gunas.*[3] In Me there is neither night[4] nor day[4] nor their juncture[4] as I am always of the nature of light.[5]

सर्वमूर्तिवियुक्तं यद्यथा खं सूक्ष्ममद्वयम् ।
तेनाप्यस्मि विनाभूतं ब्रह्मैवाहं तथाऽद्वयम् ॥ २१ ॥

21. Just as the ether is subtle, without a second and devoid of all forms, so, I am the non-dual *Brahman* devoid even of the ether.

ममात्मा स्वत आत्मेति भेदो व्योम्नो यथा भवेत् ।
एकस्य सुषिभेदेन तथा मम विकल्पितः ॥ २२ ॥

22. The distinction between the Self in Itself[6] and my Self is due to the superimposition (of different[7] adjuncts on one and the same Self), just as difference

[1] Earth, water, and fire. [2] Air and ether.
[3] *Sattva, rajas* and *tamas*, the three constituent essences of *Mâyâ*, the Power of *Brahman* transforming itself into the universe. See Bh. Gîtâ, 14. 5-19. [4] These words may also mean deep sleep, waking and dream respectively. [5] I.e., Consciousness.
[6] *Brahman.* [7] The intellect etc.

(is wrongly conceived to) exist in one and the same ether owing to apertures (in various objects).

भेदोऽभेदस्तथा चैको नाना चेति विकल्पितः ।
ज्ञेयं ज्ञाता गतिर्गन्ता मय्येकस्मिन्कुतो भवेत् ॥ २३ ॥

23. How can difference, absence of difference, oneness, manyness and the qualities of being known and being a knower, the results of actions and also agency and experiencing be attributed to Me who am one only ?

न मे हेयं न चादेयमविकारी यतो ह्यहम् ।
सदा मुक्तस्तथा शुद्धः सदा बुद्धोऽगुणोऽद्वयः ॥ २४ ॥

24. I have nothing to reject or accept inasmuch as I am changeless. Always free, pure, awakened and without qualities, I am without a second.

इत्येवं सर्वदात्मानं विद्यात्सर्वं समाहितः ।
विदित्वा मां स्वदेहस्थमृषिर्मुक्तो ध्रुवो भवेत् ॥ २५ ॥

25. One should, with great concentration of mind, always know the Self to be All.[1] One certainly becomes all-knowing and free when one knows Me to be residing is one's own body.[2]

कृतकृत्यश्च सिद्धश्च योगी ब्राह्मण एव च ।
य एवं वेद तत्त्वार्थमन्यथा ह्यात्महा भवेत् ॥ २६ ॥

26. He who thus knows the reality of the Self becomes successful in attaining the goal of his life and

[1] *Brahman.* [2] As the witness of the body gross and subtle.

becomes perfect. He becomes a Knower of *Brahman* and one[1] with It. One knowing the Self otherwise may be said to commit suicide.[2]

वेदार्थो निश्चितो ह्येष समासेन मयोदितः ।
संन्यासिभ्यः प्रवक्तव्यः शान्तेभ्यः शिष्टबुद्धिना ॥ २७ ॥

27. This ascertained meaning of the *Vedas* described briefly by me should be imparted to those who have given up worldly action and controlled their minds by one whose intellect has been trained (according to the scriptures under a teacher who has known *Brahman*).

[1] For a Knower of *Brahman* becomes *Brahman*. See Tai. U., 2. 1.
[2] For tbe Self remains hidden, killed as it were. See Īsh. U., 3.

स्वप्नस्मृतिप्रकरणम् ॥ १४ ॥

CHAPTER XIV

DREAM AND MEMORY

स्वप्नस्मृत्योर्घटादेर्हि रूपाभासः प्रदृश्यते ।
पुरा नूनं तदाकारा धीर्दृष्टेत्यनुमीयते ॥ १ ॥

1 As the resemblance of (objects of knowledge like) jars etc. is perceived in dream and memory it is inferred that the intellect in those forms was surely seen before.

भिक्षामटन्यथा स्वप्ने दृष्टो देहो न स स्वयम् ।
जाग्रद्दृश्यात्तथा देहाद्द्रष्टृत्वादन्य एव सः ॥ २ ॥

2. Just as the body going from place to place for alms[1] seen (e.g. by a wandering mendicant) in dream is not oneself, so, witnessing the body in the waking state the Seer must be different from it as it is seen.

मूषासिक्तं यथा ताम्रं तन्निभं जायते तथा ।
रूपादीन्व्याप्नुवच्चित्तं तन्निभं दृश्यते ध्रुवम् ॥ ३ ॥

[1] The only means of subsistence, according to the scriptures, for those who have given up worldly action in search of the knowledge of *Brahman.*

3. Pervading objects like forms, colours, etc. the mind appears to be exactly like them, just as (molten) copper assumes the form of a mould when poured into it.

व्यञ्जको वा यथालोको व्यङ्ग्यस्याकारतामियात् ।
सर्वार्थव्यञ्जकत्वाद्धीरर्थाकारा प्रदृश्यते ॥ ४ ॥

4. Or, just as light, the revealer assumes the forms of the objects revealed by it, so, the intellect looks like all things inasmuch as it reveals them.

धीरेवार्थस्वरूपा हि पुंसा दृष्टा पुरापि च ।
न चेत्स्वप्ने कथं पश्येत्स्मरतो वाऽऽकृतिः कुतः ॥ ५ ॥

5. It was the intellect in the forms of objects of knowledge that was seen before [1] by the seer ; how can he see them in dream or remember their forms if that were not the case ?

व्यञ्जकत्वं तदेवास्या रूपाद्याकारदृश्यता ।
द्रष्टृत्वं च दृशेस्तद्व्याप्तिः स्याद्धिय उद्भवे ॥ ६ ॥

6. That intellect is seen in the forms of objects of vision etc. is what is meant by saying that it reveals [2] them. The Self is said to witness the modifications of the intellect as It pervades [2] them whenever they arise.

[1] In the state of waking and experiencing.

[2] In assuming the forms of objects the intellect gets changed ; but the Self does not get changed in pervading the modifications of the intellect. It does it by means of Its reflection.

चिन्मात्रज्योतिषा सर्वाः सर्वदेहेषु बुद्धयः ।
मया यस्मात्प्रकाश्यन्ते सर्वस्यात्मा ततो ह्यहम् ॥ ७ ॥

7. I am the Self of all as the intellects of all beings are illumined by Me who am of the nature of the Light of Consciousness only.

करणं कर्म कर्ता च क्रिया स्वप्ने फलं च धीः ।
जाग्रत्येवं यतो दृष्टा द्रष्टा तस्मादतोऽन्यथा ॥ ८ ॥

8. It is the intellect[1] that becomes the instrument, the object, the agent, actions and their results in dream. It is known to be so in the waking state also.[2] The Seer[3] is, therefore, different from the intellect (and its objects).

बुद्ध्यादीनामनात्मत्वं हेयोपादेयरूपतः ।
हानोपादानकर्तात्मा न त्याज्यो न च गृह्यते ॥ ९ ॥

9. As they are susceptible of appearance and disappearance the intellect etc. are not the Self. The Self is the cause[4] of their appearance and disappearance and cannot be made to appear or disappear.

सबाह्याभ्यन्तरे शुद्धे प्रज्ञानैकरसे घने ।
बाह्यमाभ्यन्तरं चान्यत्कथं हेयं प्रकल्प्यते ॥ १० ॥

10. How can an interior, an exterior or any other thing be attributed to the Self which comprises the

[1] As there are no external objects in that state. See Br. U., 4. 3. 10.
[2] For the existence of external objects depends on the intellect. Otherwise they might be perceived in deep sleep also when the intellect is not there.
[3] The Self.
[4] The substratum.

interior[1] and exterior,[1] is pure and of the nature of homogeneous Consciousness ?

य आत्मा नेतिनेतीति परापोह्नेन शेषितः ।
स चेद्ब्रह्मविदात्मेष्टो यतेतातः परं कथम् ॥ ११ ॥

11. Why should a knower of *Brahman* make anymore effort if the Self which is left over by negating the non-Self according to the *Sruti*, 'Not this, not this' is considered to be his Self ?

अशनाय्याद्यतिक्रान्तं ब्रह्मैवास्मि निरन्तरम् ।
कार्यवान्स्यां कथं चाहं विमृशेदेवमञ्जसा ॥ १२ ॥

12. One should rightly think thus : I am all-pervading *Brahman* beyond hunger etc. ; how can I have actions ?

पारगस्तु यथा नद्यास्तत्स्थः पारं यियासति ।
आत्मज्ञश्चेत्तथा कार्यं कर्तुमन्यदिहेच्छति ॥ १३ ॥

13. A knower of the Self will wish to perform actions if one who has reached the other bank of a river wish to reach that bank while there.

आत्मज्ञस्यापि यस्य स्याद्धानोपादानता यदि ।
न मोक्षार्हः स विज्ञेयो वान्तोऽसौ ब्रह्मणा ध्रुवम् ॥ १४ ॥

14. A (so-called) knower of the Self having the ideas of acceptance and rejection should be regarded as

[1] See footnote 1, verse 43, Chapter 17 and Mu. U., 2. 1. 2.

not fit for liberation but must be considered to be certainly rejected by *Brahman.*

सादित्यं हि जगत्प्राणस्तस्मान्नाहर्निशैव वा ।
प्राणज्ञस्यापि न स्यातां कुतो ब्रह्मविदोऽद्वये ॥ १५ ॥

15. Even[1] for a knower of *Prâna*[2] the world with the sun is *Prâna* and, therefore, there is no day[3] or night[3] for him; how then can they be for a knower[4] of *Brahman* in which there is no duality?

न स्मरत्यात्मनो ह्यात्मा विस्मरेद्वाप्यलुप्तचित् ।
मनोऽपि स्मरतीत्येतज्ज्ञानमज्ञानहेतुजम् ॥ १६ ॥

16. The Self whose Consciousness never ceases to exist neither remembers[5] nor forgets Itself. That the mind remembers the Self is also a knowledge caused by Ignorance.[6]

ज्ञातुर्ज्ञेयः परो ह्यात्मा सोऽविद्याकल्पितः स्मृतः ।
अपोढे विद्यया तस्मिन्रज्ज्वां सर्प इवाद्वयः ॥ १७ ॥

17. If the supreme Self be an object of the knowledge of the knower, it must be a superimposition due to Ignorance. It is the Self without a second when that superimposition is negated by right knowledge like a snake in a rope.

[1] Though he has not gone beyond all difference.

[2] *Prâna* is the being identifying himself with the universe. A meditator on *Prâna* gets identified with him.

[3] So, no duties to be done in particular hours of the day and night.

[4] Who has gone beyond duality.

[5] Therefore a man of knowledge is free from the duty of concentrating his mind. (See footnote 3, previous verse.)

[6] For the mind is non-conscious and cannot remember anything.

कर्तृकर्मफलाभावात्सबाह्याभ्यन्तरं ह्यजम् ।
ममाहं वेत्ति यो भावस्तस्मिन्कस्य कुतो भवेत् ॥ १८ ॥

18. Who (and for what reason) will attribute the ideas of 'me' and 'mine' to the Self as It is unborn and comprises the interior[1] and exterior on account of the fact that the agent, actions and their results do not exist ?

आत्मा ह्यात्मीय इत्येष भावोऽविद्याप्रकल्पितः ।
आत्मैकत्वे ह्यसौ नास्ति बीजाभावे कुतः फलम् ॥ १९ ॥

19. For the ideas 'me' and 'mine' are superimposed (on the Self) due to Ignorance. They do not exist when the Self is known to be one only. How can there be an effect without a cause ?

द्रष्टृ श्रोतृ तथा मन्तृ विज्ञात्रेव तदक्षरम् ।
द्रष्ट्राद्यन्यन्न तद्यस्मात्तस्माद्द्रष्टाऽहमक्षरम् ॥ २० ॥

20. It is (the individual Self known to be) the seer, the hearer, the thinker and the knower that is (*Brahman*), the imperishable One. As the individual Self is not different from It, I, the seer, am the imperishable Principle.

स्थावरं जङ्गमं चैव द्रष्टृत्वादिक्रियायुतम् ।
सर्वमक्षरमेवातः सर्वस्यात्माक्षरं त्वहम् ॥ २१ ॥

21. As all beings, moving and non-moving, are endowed with actions such as, seeing etc. they are

[1] Footnote 2, verse 43, Chap. 17 and also see Mu. U., 2. 1. 2.

(*Brahman*), the imperishable One. Therefore I am the Self of all, the indestructible One.

अकार्यशेषमात्मानमक्रियात्मक्रियाफलम् ।
निर्ममं निरहंकारं यः पश्यति स पश्यति ॥ २२ ॥

22. He has the truest knowledge who looks upon the Self as a non-agent having no connection with actions and their results and regards It as free from the ideas of 'me' and 'mine'.

ममाहंकारयत्नेच्छाः शून्या एव स्वभावतः ।
आत्मनीति यदि ज्ञातमास्ध्वं स्वस्थाः किमीहितैः ॥ २३ ॥

23. Be in peace. What is the use of efforts if the Self has been known to be naturally free from the ideas 'me' and 'mine' and from efforts and desires?

योऽहंकर्तारमात्मानं तथा वेत्तारमेव च ।
वेत्ति नात्मज्ञ एवासौ योऽन्यथाज्ञः स आत्मवित् ॥ २४ ॥

24. One who looks upon the Self as an agent of actions and a knower of objects is not a knower of the Self. One who knows It otherwise[1] is a real knower of It.

यथान्यत्वेऽपि तादात्म्यं देहादिष्वात्मनो मतम् ।
तथाऽकर्तुरविज्ञानात्फलकर्मात्मतात्मनः ॥ २५ ॥

25. Just as the Self is identified with the body etc., though different from them, so, It is looked upon as the agent of actions and the experiencer of their results

[1] As a non-agent and non-experiencer.

owing to the fact that It is not[1] known to be a non-agent.

दृष्टिः श्रुतिर्मतिर्ज्ञातिः स्वप्ने दृष्टा जनैः सदा ।
तासामात्मस्वरूपत्वादतः प्रत्यक्षतात्मनः ॥ २६ ॥

26. Seeing,[2] hearing, thinking and knowing are always experienced by people in dream. Moreover, as they are essentially the Self It is directly Known.

[The meaning is this : The mind merges in the Self as Primeval Ignorance during deep sleep but the Self then, as always, exists in its nature of Pure Consciousness. Therefore it is clear that the Self is different from the mind and exists as the witness of this phenomenon ; that is what is meant by saying in the verse that the Self is directly known.]

परलोकभयं यस्य नास्ति मृत्युभयं तथा ।
तस्यात्मज्ञस्य शोच्याः स्युः सब्रह्मेन्द्रा अपीश्वराः ॥ २७ ॥

27. Even powerful beings including *Brahmâ*[3] and *Indra*[4] are objects of pity to that knower of the Self who has no fear about the next world nor is afraid of death.

ईश्वरत्वेन किं तस्य ब्रह्मेन्द्रत्वेन वा पुनः ।
तृष्णा चेत्सर्वतश्छिन्ना सर्वदैन्योद्भवाऽशुभा ॥ २८ ॥

[1] I. e., The Self is not discriminated from the subtle body.
[2] These are mental modifications through the instrumentality of various organs. As the mind with these modifications is witnessed by the Self in dream It must be different from them.
[3] See footnote 3, verse 4, Chapter 9 of this book.
[4] The king of gods in heaven.

28. What is the use of his becoming a powerful one or becoming *Brahmâ* or *Indra* if all inauspicious desires, the cause of misery, are entirely uprooted ?

अहमित्यात्मधीर्या च ममेत्यात्मीयधीरपि ।
अर्थशून्ये यदा यस्य स आत्मज्ञो भवेत्तदा ॥ २९ ॥

29. He is a Knower of the Self to whom the ideas 'me' and 'mine' have become quite meaningless.[1]

बुद्ध्यादौ सत्युपाधौ च तथासत्यविशेषता ।
यस्य चेदात्मनो ज्ञाता तस्य कार्यं कथं भवेत् ॥ ३० ॥

30. How can there be any action in one who finds no difference in the Self both when[2] the intellect etc., Its adjuncts exist and when[3] they do not ?

प्रसन्ने विमले व्योम्नि प्रज्ञानैकरसेऽद्वये ।
उत्पन्नात्मधियो ब्रूत किमन्यत्कार्यमिष्यते ॥ ३१ ॥

31. Say what action might be desired to be done by one who has known himself to be without a second, who is of the nature of homogeneous consciousness and who is devoid of impurities, both natural and adventitious, like the ether.

आत्मानं सर्वभूतस्थममित्रं चात्मनोऽपि यः ।
पश्यन्निच्छत्यसौ नूनं शीतीकर्तुं विभावसुम् ॥ ३२ ॥

32. He who sees the Self in all beings and at the same time feels that he has enemies desires surely to make fire cold.

[1] I.e., unreal. [2] In waking and dream. [3] In deep sleep.

प्रज्ञाप्राणानुकार्यात्मा छायेवाक्षादिगोचरः ।
ध्यायतीवेति चोक्तो हि शुद्धो मुक्तः स्वतो हि सः ॥ ३३ ॥

33. The Self which has for Its adjuncts the intellect and the vital force is reflected in the modifications of the intellect and in the senses like the sun reflected in water (for example). The Self is free and pure by nature (even in that condition) as it is said in the *Sruti*,[1] " It is at rest as it were."

[The real sun in the sky never moves with the movement of the water in which it is reflected though the reflection does so. So, the Self does not change with the changes in the intellect in which It is reflected. The meaning of the *Sruti* quoted is that the Self, in no condition, has either rest or motion ; It is always pure. Rest and motion are in the intellect.]

अप्राणस्यामनस्कस्य तथाऽसंसर्गिणो दृशेः ।
व्योमवद्व्यापिनो ह्यस्य कथं कार्यं भवेन्मम ॥ ३४ ॥

34. How can I have actions who am Pure Consciousness devoid of the vital force and the mind, unattached and all-pervading like the ether ?

असमाधिं न पश्यामि निर्विकारस्य सर्वदा ।
ब्रह्मणो मे विशुद्धस्य शोध्यं नान्यद्विपाप्मनः ॥ ३५ ॥
गन्तव्यं च तथा नैव सर्वगस्याचलस्य च ।
नोर्ध्वं नाधस्तिरो वापि निष्कलस्यागुणत्वतः ॥ ३६ ॥

35, 36. As I am *Brahman*, always changeless and pure, I never see the absence of concentration in Me ;

[1] Br. U., 4. 3. 7.

and free from sin and virtue I find nothing in Me to be purified. As I am without parts, without qualities, without motion and all-pervading I do not find, on my part, the action of going or a place[1] to go to; nor do I find an upward, a downward, or an oblique direction.

चिन्मात्रज्योतिषो नित्यं तमस्तस्मिन्न विद्यते ।
कथं कार्यं ममैवाद्य नित्यमुक्तस्य शिष्यते ॥ ३७ ॥

37. How can any action be left for Me who am ever free; for the Self is always of the nature of the Light of Pure Consciousness and hence devoid of Ignorance.

अमनस्कस्य का चिन्ता क्रिया वानिन्द्रियस्य का ।
अप्राणो ह्यमनाः शुभ्र इति सत्यं श्रुतेर्वचः ॥ ३८ ॥

38. How can there be any thought in one who has no mind, and actions in one who has no senses? The *Sruti*[2] truly says that the Self is 'pure, devoid of the vital[3] force and the mind'.

अकालत्वाददेशत्वाददिक्त्वादनिमित्ततः ।
आत्मनो नैव कालादेरपेक्षा ध्यायतः सदा ॥ ३९ ॥

39. Always meditating on the Self one has nothing to do with time[4] etc. as the Self is in no[5] way connected with time, space, direction and causation.

[1] E. g., the sphere of *Brahmâ* where the knowers of the qualified *Brahman* go at the end of their earthly career.
[2] Mu. U., 2. 1. 2.
[3] including the senses.
[4] The proper time, place, etc. are, on the other hand, necessary for *Vedic* actions.
[5] See Br. Su., 4. 1. 11.

यस्मिन्देवाश्च वेदाश्च पवित्रं कृत्स्नमेकताम् ।
व्रजेत्तन्मानसं तीर्थं यस्मिन्स्नात्वाऽमृतो भवेत् ॥ ४० ॥

40. The mind[1] is the place of pilgrimage[2] where the *devas*,[3] the *Vedas*[4] and all other purifying agencies[5] become one.[6] A bath[7] in that place of pilgrimage makes one immortal.

न चास्ति शब्दादिरनन्यवेदनः परस्परेणापि न चैव दृश्यते ।
परेण दृश्यास्तु यथा रसादयस्तथैव दृश्यत्वत एव दैहिकाः ॥ ४१ ॥

41. (Non-conscious objects of Knowledge like) sound etc.[8] cannot illumine themselves nor one another. Therefore taste etc.[8] are illumined by one[9] other than themselves. They pertain to the body as they are objects of knowledge.

अहंममेत्येषणयत्नविक्रियासुखादयस्तद्वदिह प्रदृश्यतः ।
दृश्यत्वयोगाच्च परस्परेण ते न दृश्यतां यान्ति ततः परो भवान् ॥

42. The objects of knowledge, the ego and other changes described as 'mine', such as, desires, efforts, pleasure etc. cannot, similarly,[10] illumine themselves. They cannot illumine one another for the same reason.[11] You, the Self, are, therefore, different from them.

[1] The consciousness 'I am *Brahman*'. [2] Because it makes a man free from Ignorance, the root of all sins and virtues. [3] The presiding deities of places of pilgrimage. [4] The study etc. of the *Vedas*. [5] The uttering of sacred names etc. [6] Because of the appearance of the all-pervading *Brahman* in the mind. [7] Merging in *Brahman*, just as a man merges into water while bathing.
[8] Sound, touch, sight, taste and smell. [9] The Self.
[10] Like sound, touch, etc.; see the above verse. [11] As they are objects of knowledge.

अहंक्रियाद्या हि समस्तविक्रिया सकर्तृका कर्मफलेन संहता ।
चितिस्वरूपेण समन्ततोऽर्कवत्प्रकाश्यमानाऽसिततात्मनो ह्यतः ॥

43. All the change such as, egoism etc. have an agent and are connected with the results of actions. They are illumined completely by Pure Consciousness like the sun. The Self, therefore, is free from bondage.

दृशिस्वरूपेण हि सर्वदेहिनां वियद्यथा व्याप्य मनांस्यवस्थितः ।
अतो न तस्माद्परोऽस्ति वेदिता परोऽपि तस्मादत एक ईश्वरः ॥

44. As the minds of all embodied beings are pervaded by the Self as Consciousness which is Its nature like the ether[1] there is neither a lower[2] nor a higher[3] knower other than Itself. So, there is one non-dual universal Self[4] only.

शरीरबुद्धयोर्यदि चान्यदृश्यता निरात्मवादाः सुनिराकृता मया ।
परश्च शुद्धो ह्यविशुद्धिकर्मतः सुनिर्मलः सर्वगतोऽसितोऽद्वयः ॥

45. The doctrine[5] that there is no Self has been well refuted by me as the gross and the subtle bodies are illumined by one[6] different from them. It[6] is unalloyed with actions[7] that cause impurity and beyond them. It is very pure, all-pervading, free from bondage and without a second.

घटादिरूपं यदि तेन गृह्यते मनः प्रवृत्तं बहुधा स्ववृत्तिभिः ।
अशुद्धयचिद्रूपविकारदोषता मतेर्यथा वारयितुं न पार्यते ॥ ४६ ॥

[1] Which pervades jars etc. [2] The individual Self. [3] *Iswara* the creator, preserver and the destroyer of the universe. [4] Pure Consciousness.

[5] It stands for the doctrines that the Self is a void, that It is momentary and so on. [6] The Self. [7] I.e., sin and virtue.

46. If, according to you, the mind which assumes various forms like those of jars and other things through its modifications be not illumined (by the Self) the defects in It, in the forms of impurity, non-consciousness and change, cannot be prevented like those in the mind.

[If one does not accept that the Self is the witness of the mind and, therefore, unattached to it it is inevitable that the defects of the mind will tarnish the Self. Liberation becomes impossible in that case.]

यथा विशुद्धं गगनं निरन्तरं न सज्जते नापि च लिप्यते तथा ।
समस्तभूतेषु सदैव तेष्वयं समः सदात्मा ह्यजरोऽमरोऽभयः ॥४७॥

47. Just as the pure and limitless ether does not get attached nor tainted, so, the Self is always the same in all beings and free from old age, death and fear.

अमूर्तमूर्तानि च कर्मवासना दृशिस्वरूपस्य बहिः प्रकल्पिताः ।
अविद्यया ह्यात्मनि मूढदृष्टिभिरपोह्य नेतीत्यवशेषितो दृशिः ॥४८॥

48. The elements[1] with and without forms and the seat[2] of desires, superimposed through delusion by ignorant people on the Self, are thrown[3] out of It which consists of Consciousness only on the authority of the *Vedic* evidence, 'Not this, not this'. The Self alone is then left over.

[In this verse the whole of the gross and the subtle universes are negated from the Self.]

[1] The gross body consisting of the five elements. See Br. U., 2. 3. 1—4. [2] The subtle body. See Br. U., 2. 3. 5. 6.
[3] I.e., negated from It.

प्रबोधरूपं मनसोऽर्थयोगजं स्मृतौ च सुप्तस्य च दृश्यतोऽर्थवत् ।
तथैव देहप्रतिमानतः पृथग्दृशेः शरीरं च मनश्च दृश्यतः ॥ ४९ ॥

49. The impressions arising on account of the contact of the mind with the objects known in the waking state are perceived like objects [1] in memory and dream. So the body, the mind and their impressions [2] are different from the Self as they are objects of perception.[3]

स्वभावशुद्धे गगने घनादिके मलेऽपयाते सति चाविशेषता ।
यथाच, तद्वच्छ्रुतिवारितद्वये सदाऽविशेषो गगनोपमे दृशौ ॥५०॥

50. Just as impurities like clouds etc. do not produce any alteration in the naturally pure ether by their appearance or disappearance; so, there is never any alteration in the ether-like Consciousness free from duality negated by the *Sruti*.

[1] I.e. like those in the waking state. [2] Br. U., 2. 3. 6.
[3] The meaning is this: as they are objects of perception the body etc. are unreal like dream objects.

नान्यदन्यत्प्रकरणम् ॥ १५ ॥

CHAPTER XV

IMPOSSIBILITY OF ONE BEING ANOTHER

नान्यदन्यद्भवेद्यस्मान्नान्यत्किंचिद्विचिन्तयेत् ।
अन्यस्यान्यत्वभावे हि नाशस्तस्य ध्रुवो भवेत् ॥ १ ॥

1. As one cannot become another one should not consider *Brahman* to be different from oneself. For if one becomes another one is sure to be destroyed.

[The idea is this : The individual Self, if considered to be really different from *Brahman*, cannot become *Brahman* as long as it exists ; and if it were destroyed who would then become *Brahman* ? Therefore one should know that one is not different from It and It is not different from one.]

स्मरतो दृश्यते दृष्टं पटे चित्रमिवार्पितम् ।
यत्र येन च तौ ज्ञेयौ सत्त्वक्षेत्रज्ञसंज्ञकौ ॥ २ ॥

2. Things seen (in the waking state) are seen like a picture painted on a canvas when one remembers them. Those by and in which they are so seen are (respectively) known to be the individual Self and the intellect.

फलान्तं चानुभूतं यद्युतं कर्त्रादिकारकैः ।
स्मर्यमाणं हि कर्मस्थं पूर्वं कर्मैव तच्चितः ॥ ३ ॥

3. What is perceived to be connected with *kârakas*[1] and entailing results[2] is (found to be) in the (category of) objects when it is remembered. The seat,[3] therefore, (in which it was perceived before) was an object[4] of Consciousness.

द्रष्टुश्चान्यद्भवेद्दृश्यं दृश्यत्वाद्धटवत्सदा ।
दृश्याद्द्रष्टाऽसजातीयो न धीवत्साक्षितान्यथा ॥ ४ ॥

4. The seen (e. g., the intellect) is always different from the seer as it is an object of knowledge like a jar. The seer is of a nature different from that of the seen. Otherwise the seer would be devoid of the nature of being the witness like the intellect.

स्वात्मबुद्धिमपेक्ष्यासौ विधीनां स्यात्प्रयोजकः ।
जात्यादिः शववत्तेन तद्धानात्मतान्यथा ॥ ५ ॥

5. When they are considered to be one's own, caste etc. become the cause of injunctions like a dead[5] body. They do not, therefore, belong to the Self.[6] The Self would otherwise[7] become the non-Self.

[1] (In grammar) the relation subsisting between a noun and a verb in a sentence (or between a noun and other words governing it).

[2] Pleasure and pain. [3] The intellect. [4] See verse 1, Chapter 14.

[5] A dead body thought to be one's father or mother becomes the cause of being cremated by sons and others.

[6] Like the dead body which is no longer a father or a mother.

[7] If caste etc., were regarded as belonging to the Self.

न प्रियाप्रिय इत्युक्तेर्नादेहत्वं क्रियाफलम् ।
देहयोगः क्रियाहेतुस्तस्माद्विद्वान्क्रियास्त्यजेत् ॥ ६ ॥

6. As it is said (in the *Sruti*,[1]) 'pleasure and pain (do not touch one who is bodiless[2])', Bodilessness[3] is not the result of actions. The cause[4] of our connection with a body is action. Therefore an aspirant after knowledge should renounce actions.

कर्मस्वात्मा स्वतन्त्रश्चेन्निवृत्तं च तथेष्यताम् ।
अदेहत्वे फलेऽकार्ये ज्ञाते कुर्यात्कथं क्रियाः ॥ ७ ॥

7. If the Self is considered to be independent with regard to the performance of actions, It must be so with regard to their renunciation also. Why should, therefore, one perform actions when the result[5] is known to be Bodilessness[5] which cannot be produced by actions ?

जात्यादीन्संपरित्यज्य निमित्तं कर्मणां बुधः ।
कर्महेतुविरुद्धं यत्स्वरूपं शास्त्रतः स्मरेत् ॥ ८ ॥

8. After giving up caste etc. which are the causes of duties a wise man should (constantly) remember from the scriptures his own real nature which[6] is incompatible with causes[7] of duties.

आत्मैकः सर्वभूतेषु तानि तस्मिंश्च खे यथा ।
पर्यगाद्व्योमवत्सर्वं शुक्रं दीप्तिमदिष्यते ॥ ९ ॥

[1] Chh. U., 8. 12. 1. [2] I.e., liberated even in life. [3] Liberation.
[4] See verse 3, Chap. 1, Part II. [5] Liberation.
[6] When known. [7] Caste etc., due to ignorance of the Self.

9. The one and the same Self is in all beings and they are in It just as all beings are in the ether. As by the ether, everything is pervaded by the Self which is considered to be pure and consisting of the Light of Pure Consciousness.

व्रणस्नाय्वोरभावेन स्थूलं देहं निवारयेत् ।
शुद्धापापतयालेपं लिङ्गं चाकायमित्युत ॥ १० ॥

10. By negating wounds and sinews the *Sruti*[1] negates the gross body (from the Self). Being pure and free from sin and virtue the Self is free (from all the impressions of pain and pleasure). The *Sruti*[1] again discards the subtle body by calling the Self bodiless.

वासुदेवो यथाश्वत्थे स्वदेहे चाब्रवीत्समम् ।
तद्वद्वेत्ति य आत्मानं समं स ब्रह्मवित्तमः ॥ ११ ॥

11. One Knowing the Self to be the same (everywhere) like Vâsudeva[2] who speaks of the same Self residing in a *pipal*[3] tree and in his own body is the best of the knowers of *Brahman*.

यथा ह्यन्यशरीरेषु ममाहन्ता न चेष्यते ।
अस्मिंश्चापि तथा देहे धीसाक्षित्वाविशेषतः ॥ १२ ॥

12. Just as the ideas of 'me' and 'mine' are not thought to exist in other bodies, so, also they do not exist in one's own. For the Self is the common witness of all intellects.

[1] Îsh. U., 8. [2] Sri Krishna. [3] Bh. Gitâ, 10. 26.

रूपसंस्कारतुल्याधी रागद्वेषौ भयं च यत् ।
गृह्यते धीश्रयं तस्माज्ज्ञाता शुद्धोऽभयः सदा ॥ १३ ॥

13. Desire, aversion and fear have a seat[1] common with that of the impressions of colours. As they have for their seat the intellect the knower, the Self is always pure[2] and devoid of fear.

यन्मनास्तन्मयोऽन्यत्वे नात्मत्वाप्तौ क्रियात्मनि ।
आत्मत्वे चानपेक्षत्वात्सापेक्षं हि न तत्स्वयम् ॥ १४ ॥

14. The meditator assumes the form of the object meditated upon ; for the latter is different from the former ; (but) there can be no such actions[3] in the Self for Its establishment in Itself as It is the self and independent of actions. For It would not be the Self if It[4] depended on actions.

खमिवैकरसा ज्ञप्तिरविभक्ताजराऽमला ।
चक्षुराद्युपधानात्सा विपरीता विभाव्यते ॥ १५ ॥

15. Pure Consciousness, like the ether,[5] is of one homogeneous nature, undivided, without old age and without impurity. It is conceived to be of a contrary nature on account of adjuncts such as, the eye etc.

दृश्यत्वादहमित्येष नात्मधर्मो घटादिवत् ।
तथान्ये प्रत्यया ज्ञेया दोषाश्चात्माऽमलो ह्यतः ॥ १६ ॥

[1] The intellect and not the Self.
[2] Free from desire and aversion. [3] like meditation etc.
[4] Liberation which is of the nature of the Self.
[5] 'Nirnayasàgar' and 'Lotus Library' texts read स्वम् ।

16. What is called the ego is not the property of the Self as it is an object of perception like jars and other things. So are to be known the other functions and the impurities[1] of the mind. The Self, therefore, is without any impurity.

सर्वप्रत्ययसाक्षित्वादविकारी च सर्वगः ।
विक्रियेत यदि द्रष्टा बुद्ध्यादीवाल्पविद्भवेत् ॥ १७ ॥

17. The Self is changeless and all-pervading on account of Its being the witness of all the functions of the mind. It would be of limited knowledge like the intellect etc. if It were subject to change.[2]

न दृष्टिर्लुप्यते द्रष्टुश्चक्षुरादेर्यथैव तत् ।
नहि द्रष्टुरिति ह्युक्तं तस्माद्द्रष्टा सदैकदृक् ॥ १८ ॥

18. Unlike the knowledge gained through the eye etc. the Knowledge[3] of the Knower does not cease to exist. It is said that, 'the Knowledge[3] of the Knower does not go out of existence'. The Knower, therefore, is always of the homogeneous nature of Knowledge.[3]

संघातो वास्मि भूतानां करणानां तथैव च ।
व्यस्तं वान्यतमो वास्मि को वास्मीति विचारयेत् ॥ १९ ॥

19. One should discriminate thus : Who am I ? Am I a combination of the elements or the senses, or am I any one of them separately ?[4]

[1] These stand for all the qualities of the mind, good and bad.
[2] Verses 157, 158, Chap 18. [3] Pure Consciousness.
[4] Br. U., 4. 3. 23.

व्यस्तं नाहं समस्तं वा भूतमिन्द्रियमेव वा ।
ज्ञेयत्वात्करणत्वाच्च ज्ञातान्योऽस्माद्घटादिवत् ॥ २० ॥

20. I am not any one of the elements separately nor their aggregate; similarly, I am not any one of the senses nor their aggregate; for they are objects (like jars etc.) and instruments (like axes etc.) of knowledge respectively. The knower is different from all these.

आत्माग्नेरिन्धना बुद्धिरविद्याकामकर्मभिः ।
दीपिता प्रज्वलत्येषा द्वारैः श्रोत्रादिभिः सदा ॥ २१ ॥

21. (Placed[1]) like fuel[2] in the fire of the Self and burning brightly by Ignorance, desire and action the intellect always shines forth through the doors called ears etc.

दक्षिणाक्षिप्रधानेषु यदा बुद्धिर्विचेष्टते ।
विषयैर्हविषा दीप्ता ह्यात्माग्निः स्थूलभुक्तदा ॥ २२ ॥

22. The fire of the Self is the experiencer of gross objects (in the waking state) when the intellect, ignited[3] by oblations, the objects function among the senses of which the right[4] eye is the chief.

हूयन्ते तु हवींषीति रूपादिग्रहणे स्मरन् ।
अरागद्वेष आत्माग्नौ जाग्रद्दोषैर्न लिप्यते ॥ २३ ॥

[1] One gets unattached if one considers the perceptions of objects to be oblations to the fire of the Self. [2] Fuel keeps fire burning. The intellect keeps the Self in manifestation.

[3] Assuming the forms of. [4] For it is well-known that the right part of the body is superior to the left.

23. One does not get attached to the impurities of the waking state if, at the time of perceiving colours etc., one remembers that oblations are being offered to the fire of the Self[1] and remains free from desire and aversion.

मानसे तु गृहे व्यक्तः सोऽविद्याकर्मवासनाम् ।
पश्यंस्तैजस आत्मोक्तः स्वयंज्योतिः प्रकाशिता ॥ २४ ॥

24. Manifested in the abode of (the modifications of) the mind (in dream) and witnessing the impressions produced by actions[2] due to Ignorance the Self is called *Taijasa*.[3] It is then the self-effulgent witness.

विषया वासना वापि चोद्यन्ते नैव कर्मभिः ।
यदा बुद्धौ, तदा ज्ञेयः प्राज्ञ आत्मा ह्यनन्यदृक् ॥ २५ ॥

25. (In deep sleep) when neither objects nor their impressions are produced in the intellect by actions the Self, cognizant neither of objects nor of their impressions, is known to be *Prâjna*.[4]

मनोबुद्धीन्द्रियाणां या अवस्थाः कर्मचोदिताः ।
चैतन्येनैव भास्यन्ते रविणेव घटादयः ॥ २६ ॥

26. The conditions of the mind,[5] the intellect[6] and the senses,[7] produced by actions are illumined by Pure Consciousness like jars and other things by the sun.

[1] Footnote 1, verse 21 above. [2] All actions are due to Ignorance.
[3] I.e., manifested with regard to objects consisting of impressions only. [4] I.e., one of unlimited knowledge. [5] I.e., the dream state.—Râmtîrtha. [6] I.e. the state of sleep.—Râmtîrtha.
[7] I.e., the waking state.—Râmtîrtha.

तत्रैवं सति बुद्धीश्च आत्मभासावभासयन् ।
कर्ता तासां यदर्थास्ता मूढैरेवाभिधीयते ॥ २७ ॥

27. As it is so, illumining by Its Light the mental functions[1] existing for It, the Self is regarded by the ignorant only as an agent of those functions.

सर्वज्ञोऽप्यत एव स्यात्स्वेन भासात्वभासयन् ।
सर्वं, सर्वक्रियाहेतोः सर्वकृत्त्वं तथात्मनः ॥ २८ ॥

28. Therefore, also illumining everything by Its own Light the Self is considered to be all-knowing. Similarly, It is regarded as the Accomplisher of everything as It is the Cause[2] of all actions.

सोपाधिश्चैवमात्मोक्तो, निरुपाख्योऽनुपाधिकः ।
निष्कलो निर्गुणः शुद्धस्तं मनो वाक् च नाप्नुतः ॥ २९ ॥
चेतनोऽचेतनो वापि कर्ताऽकर्ता गतोऽगतः ।
बद्धो मुक्तस्तथा चैकोऽनेकः शुद्धोऽन्यथेति वा ॥ ३० ॥

29, 30. The Self with adjuncts is thus described, (But) It is without adjuncts, indescribable, without parts, without qualities and pure, which the mind and speech do not reach. (For philosophers differ in their conceptions about the Self. Different conceptions are :) the Self is (1) conscious, (2) non-conscious, (3) an agent, (4) a non-agent, (5) all-pervading, (6) not all-pervading,

[1] Through which pleasure and pain are superimposed on the Self.
[2] By Its proximity only.

(7) bound, (8) free, (9) one, (10) many, (11) pure, (12) not pure and so on.

अप्राप्यैव निवर्तन्ते वाचो धीभिः सहैव तु ।
निर्गुणत्वात्क्रियाभावाद्विशेषाणामभावतः ॥ ३१ ॥

31. Words with the mind turn back without reaching It as It is without qualities, without actions and without attributes.

व्यापकं सर्वतो व्योम मूर्तैः सर्वैर्वियोजितम् ।
यथा, तद्वदिहात्मानं विद्याच्छुद्धं परं पदम् ॥ ३२ ॥

32. One should know the Self, comparable to the ether which is all-pervading and free from all objects having forms, to be the pure and supreme Goal[1] in the *Vedântas*.

दृष्टं हित्वा स्मृतिं तस्मिन्सर्वग्रस्तं तमस्त्यजेत् ।
सर्वदृग्ज्योतिषा युक्तो दिनकृच्छार्वरं यथा ॥ ३३ ॥

33. One should give up[2] the waking state, its impressions (i.e., dream) and deep sleep which causes everything to merge in itself. The Self, the witness of them all is then in the nature of Pure Consciousness[3] like the sun which has dispelled the darkness of the night.

रूपस्मृत्यन्धकारार्थाः प्रत्यया यस्य गोचराः ।
स एवात्मा समो द्रष्टा सर्वभूतेषु सर्वगः ॥ ३४ ॥

[1] *Brahman.* [2] I.e., one should give up one's identification with them. [3] *Brahman.*

34. Illumining the modifications which have for their objects waking,[1] dream[1] and deep sleep[2] the all-pervading Self is the same in all beings and the witness of them all.

आत्मबुद्धिमनश्चक्षुर्विषयालोकसंगमात् ।
विचित्रो जायते बुद्धेः प्रत्ययोऽज्ञानलक्षणः ॥ ३५ ॥

35. Caused by Ignorance[3] the diverse functions of the intellect (called knowledge) come to exist when the body, the intellect, the mind, the eye, objects and light happen to co-exist (with the Self).

विविच्यास्मात्स्वमात्मानं विद्याच्छुद्धं परं पदम् ।
द्रष्टारं सर्वभूतस्थं समं सर्वभयातिगम् ॥ ३६ ॥
समस्तं सर्वगं शान्तं विमलं व्योमवत्स्थितम् ।
निष्कलं निष्क्रियं सर्वं नित्यं द्वन्द्वैर्विवर्जितम् ॥ ३७ ॥

36, 37. One should discriminate from these[4] the Self which is the witness, free from all fear, free from all adjuncts, free from impurity, firm like the ether, without parts and without actions, and know It to be the pure, supreme *Brahman*, the same in all beings, the all-pervading whole, the all-comprehensive Principle which is eternally free from all duality.

सर्वप्रत्ययसाक्षी ज्ञः कथं ज्ञेयो मयेत्युत ।
विमृश्यैवं विजानीयाज्ज्ञानकर्म न वेत्ति वा ॥ ३८ ॥

[1] Waking and dream are the objects of the modifications of the mind. [2] It is the object of the modification of Ignorance.
[3] Superimposed on the Self.
[4] The body, the intellect, etc. (See the previous verse).

38. One should ascertain whether Pure Consciousness, the witness of all the mental modifications [is knowable or not (and, if knowable,) whether It is an object of knowledge or not.

अदृष्टं द्रष्टृविज्ञातं दभ्रमित्यादि शासनात् ।
नैव ज्ञेयं मयान्यैर्वा परं ब्रह्म कथंचन ॥ ३९ ॥

39. The supreme *Brahman* is never capable of being known by me or others according to the teachings of the *Srutis*, 'unseen seer',[1] 'unknown[1] (knower)' and 'finite'[2] (if thought to be known), and so on.

स्वरूपाव्यवधानाभ्यां ज्ञानालोकस्वभावतः ।
अन्यज्ञानानपेक्षत्वाज्ज्ञातं चैव सदा मया ॥ ४० ॥

40. Independent of every other knowledge, of the nature of the Light of Pure Consciousness and not distanced by anything[3] *Brahman*, my own nature is always known[4] by me.

नान्येन ज्योतिषा कार्यं रवेरात्मप्रकाशने ।
स्वबोधान्नान्यबोधेच्छा बोधस्यात्मप्रकाशने ॥ ४१ ॥

41. The sun does not require any other light in order to illumine itself; so, Knowledge[5] does not require any other knowledge except that which is its own nature in order to be known.

[1] Br. U., 3. 7. 23. [2] Ke. U., 2. 1.
[3] Like the reflection of Itself. See also footnote 1, p. 60.
[4] Not as an object of knowledge but as a non-object.
[5] Pure Consciousness.

न तस्यैवान्यतोऽपेक्षा स्वरूपं यस्य यद्भवेत् ।
प्रकाशान्तरदृश्यो न प्रकाशो ह्यस्ति कश्चन ॥ ४२ ॥

42. Just as one light does not depend on another in order to be revealed, so, what is one's own nature does not depend on anything else (i.e., being of the nature of Knowledge the Self does not require another knowledge in order to be known).

व्यक्तिः स्यादप्रकाशस्य प्रकाशात्मसमागमात् ।
प्रकाशस्त्वर्ककार्यः स्यादिति मिथ्या वचो ह्यतः ॥ ४३ ॥

43.[1] A thing naturally lacking[2] luminosity gets revealed (i.e., has only its surrounding darkness removed) when in contact with something which by nature is luminous. The saying, therefore, that luminosity is an effect produced (on other things) by the sun is false.

यतोऽभूत्वा भवेद्यच्च तस्य तत्कार्यमिष्यते ।
स्वरूपत्वादभूत्वा न प्रकाशो जायते रवेः ॥ ४४ ॥

44. Something[3] non-existent[4] coming into existence[5] from something[6] else is called its effect. But light[7] which is the sun's own nature does not come into existence from previous non-existence.

[1] This half verse is an answer to the objection that Pure Consciousness, though not capable of being known by another Consciousness, knows Itself like the sun which, though not revealed by other lights, reveals itself.

[2] For a thing naturally luminous is not made luminous by anything else or by itself. So the Self which is of the nature of Knowledge cannot be known by another knowledge or by Itself.

[3] E.g., a jar. [4] Not manifested before. [5] Manifestation.

[6] E.g., earth. [7] Light seems to be in jars etc.

सत्तामात्रे प्रकाशस्य कर्तादित्यादिरिष्यते ।
घटादिव्यक्तितो यद्वत्तद्वद्बोधात्मनीष्यताम् ॥ ४५ ॥

45. Just as when jars and other things get revealed the sun and other luminous bodies are called the agents of revealing those things on account of their proximate existence only (but are not really the agents); so, the Self, Pure Consciousness only is called a knower (on account of Its existence proximate to things known but is not really an agent).

बिलात्सर्पस्य निर्याणे सूर्यो यद्वत्प्रकाशकः ।
प्रयत्नेन विना तद्वज्ज्ञाताऽऽत्मा बोधरूपतः ॥ ४६ ॥

46. Just as the sun, though devoid of effort on its part, is called the revealer of a snake coming out of its hole, so, the Self, though of the nature of Pure Conciousness only, is called a knower (without agency on Its part).

दग्धेत्रमुष्णः सत्तायां तद्वद्बोद्धाऽऽत्मनीष्यताम् ।
सत्येव यदुपाधौ तु ज्ञाते सर्पे इवोत्थिते ॥ ४७ ॥

47. Just as fire which is naturally hot is called a burner on account of its existence (proximate to things burnt), so, the Self is a knower (on account of Its existence proximate to objects[1] of knowledge) when adjuncts are known[2] like the snake coming out of its hole.

[1] Superimposed on the Self. [2] Illumined.

ज्ञाताऽयत्नोऽपि तद्वज्ज्ञः कर्ता भ्रामकवद्भवेत् ।
स्वरूपेण स्वयं नात्मा ज्ञेयोऽज्ञेयोऽथवा ततः ॥ ४८ ॥
विदिताविदिताभ्यां तदन्यदेवेति शासनात् ।
बन्धमोक्षादयो भावास्तद्वदात्मनि कल्पिताः ॥ ४९ ॥

48, 49. Just as the Self, though devoid of effort, is called a knower, so, It is called an agent, (though devoid of effort,) like the loadstone. In Its own nature, therefore, It is neither capable of being known [1] nor unknown [1] as it is taught (in the *Sruti* [2]) that the Self is different from both the known and the unknown. The ideas such as, bondage, liberation, etc. are likewise [3] superimposed on the Self.

नाहोरात्रे यथा सूर्ये प्रभारूपाविशेषतः ।
बोधरूपाविशेषान्न बोधाबोधौ तथात्मनि ॥ ५० ॥

50. Just as there is no day or night in the sun as it is of the nature of light only, so, there is no knowledge [4] or ignorance [5] in the Self which is of the nature of Pure Consciousness only.

यथोक्तं ब्रह्म यो वेद हानोपादानवर्जितम् ।
यथोक्तेन विधानेन स सत्यं नैव जायते ॥ ५१ ॥

[1] See verses 39 and 40 above. In the proximity of agents etc. the Self is called an agent and as It is actionless It is called a non-agent. [2] Ke. U., 1. 4. [3] Like agency and knowingness. See verses 45, 47 and 48 above.
[4] Therefore no liberation. [5] Therefore no bondage.

51. Knowing *Brahman*, described as having no connection with acceptance[1] or rejection[1] according to the method[2] delineated, one is certainly never born again.

जन्ममृत्युप्रवाहेषु पतितो नैव शक्नुयात् ।
इत उद्धर्तुमात्मानं ज्ञानादन्येन केनचित् ॥ ५२ ॥

52. One who has fallen into the stream of births and deaths cannot save oneself by anything else except Knowledge.

भिद्यते हृदयग्रन्थिश्छिद्यन्ते सर्वसंशयाः ।
क्षीयन्ते चास्य कर्माणि तस्मिन्दृष्ट इति श्रुतेः ॥ ५३ ॥

53. The *Sruti*[3] says that the knots[4] of the heart are torn asunder, all doubts disappear and one's actions come to an end when the Self is seen.

ममाहमित्येतदपोह्य सर्वतो विमुक्तदेहं पदमम्बरोपमम् ।
सुदृष्टशास्त्रानुमितिभ्य ईरितं विमुच्यतेऽस्मिन्यदि निश्चितो नरः ॥

54. A man gets liberated if, after discarding in all respects the ideas of 'me' and 'mine' he gets perfect conviction in the etherlike goal[5] which is devoid of (the gross and the subtle) bodies and described here according to right inference[6] and the scriptures[6] well-studied.

[1] Knowing that the Self is neither accepted nor rejected and that It does not accept or reject anything.
[2] For a clear understanding of the terms 'the Self' and '*Brahman*'. See also verse 96, Chapter 18. [3] Mu. U., 2. 2. 8.
[4] The mutual superimposition of the Self and the non-Self.
[5] Self-*Brahman*. [6] And therefore there is no possibility of there being any error here.

पार्थिवप्रकरणम् ॥ १६ ॥

CHAPTER XVI

"CONSISTING OF EARTH"[1]

पार्थिवः कठिनो धातुर्द्रवो देहे स्मृतोऽम्मयः ।
पक्तिचेष्टावकाशाः स्युर्वह्निवाय्वम्बरोद्भवाः ॥ १ ॥

1. The hard material in the body is known to be a transformation of earth; the liquid part consists of water; and heat, vibration and empty space[2] in the body are due to fire, air and ether respectively.

घ्राणादीनि तदर्थाश्च पृथिव्यादिगुणाः क्रमात् ।
रूपालोकवदिष्टं हि सजातीयार्थमिन्द्रियम् ॥ २ ॥

2. Smell etc., (i.e., the senses) and their objects are produced from earth etc. respectively as the senses have for their objects things of their own kind e.g., colour and light (the latter being of the same nature as the former, its object).

[1] The name is after the first word of this chapter in the text.
[2] I.e., the channels through which food, drink, and the mind move in the body.

बुद्ध्यर्थान्याहुरेतानि वाक्पाण्यादीनि कर्मणे ।
तद्विकल्पार्थमन्तस्थं मन एकादशं भवेत् ॥ ३ ॥

3. These[1] are called the organs of knowledge ; the larynx and the hand etc. are called the organs of action ; and the mind, the eleventh which is within the body is for the purpose of knowing different objects one after another (as they tend to present themselves at the same time).

निश्चयार्था भवेद्बुद्धिस्तां सर्वार्थानुभाविनीम् ।
ज्ञाताऽऽत्मोक्तः स्वरूपेण ज्योतिषा व्यञ्जयन्सदा ॥ ४ ॥

4. The intellect is for determining objects. Always illumining the all-pervasive[2] intellect by Its light,[3] Its own nature the Self is called the Knower.

[The purport of the above four *verses* is that the Self is different from the body, the senses, the mind and the intellect.]

व्यञ्जकस्तु यथाऽऽलोको व्यङ्ग्यस्याकारतां गतः ।
व्यतिकीर्णोऽप्यसंकीर्णस्तद्वज्ज्ञः प्रत्ययैः सदा ॥ ५ ॥

5. Just as light assumes the forms of objects revealed by it but is really different from, though (apparently) mixed up with, them, so, the Self is different from the mental modifications (whose forms It assumes[4] while revealing them).

[1] Smell etc. See the previous verse.
[2] Pervading objects one after another. [3] Consciousness.
[4] Through Its reflection.

स्थितो दीपो यथायत्नः प्राप्तं सर्वं प्रकाशयेत् ।
शब्दाद्याकारबुद्धीर्द्धः प्राप्तास्तद्वत्प्रपश्यति ॥ ६ ॥

6. The Self illumines the intellect in the forms of sound etc. present before It like a stationary lamp devoid of any effort and illumining everything within its reach.

शरीरेन्द्रियसंघात आत्मत्वेन गतां धियम् ।
नित्यात्मज्योतिषा दीप्तां विशिंषन्ति सुखादयः ॥ ७ ॥

7. Pleasure etc. qualify the intellect identifying itself with the combination of the body and the senses and getting illumined by the eternal Light of the Self.

शिरोदुःखादिनात्मानं दुःख्यस्मीति हि पश्यति ।
द्रष्टान्यो दुःखिनो दृश्याद्द्रष्टृत्वाच्च न दुःख्यसौ ॥ ८ ॥

8. For one considers oneself to be distressed by pain in the head etc. The Seer is different from the seen[1] which feels pain. The Self is free from pain as It is the Seer (of the pain).

दुःखी स्याद्दुःख्यहंमानाद्दुःखिनो दर्शनान्न वा ।
संहतेऽङ्गादिभिर्द्रष्टा दुःखी दुःखस्य नैव सः ॥ ९ ॥

9. One becomes unhappy when one *identifies* oneself with something[1] which has assumed the form of unhappiness but not by merely *seeing* it. The Witness[2] of the pain in the body which is a combination of the limbs etc. does not feel pain.

[1] The intellect.
[2] The Self.

चक्षुर्वत्कर्मकर्तृत्वं स्याच्चेन्नानेकमेव तत् ।
संहतं च, ततो नात्मा द्रष्टृत्वात्कर्मतां व्रजेत् ॥ १० ॥

10. May it not be that the Self is both object and subject like the eye ?[1] No ; the eye consists of several parts and is a combination.[2] But the Self does not become an object as It is the Seer.[3]

ज्ञानयत्नाद्यनेकत्वमात्मनोऽपि मतं यदि ।
नैकज्ञानगुणत्वात्तु ज्योतिर्वत्तस्य कर्मता ॥ ११ ॥

11. One may argue that the Self also has many qualities such as, knowledge, effort and so on (and, therefore, like the eye It may be both subject[4] and object[4]). (No, it is not so ;) It can never be an object because, like light, It has only one quality viz., Knowledge.[5]

ज्योतिषो द्योतकत्वेऽपि यद्वन्नात्मप्रकाशनम् ।
भेदेऽप्येवं समत्वाज्ज्ञ आत्मानं नैव पश्यति ॥ १२ ॥

12. Just as light, though an illuminator, does not illumine itself, so, even assuming[6] that there is a

[1] The eye becomes an object when seen in a mirror and a subject when it is in its own place. So, identified with other things the Self is an object, otherwise It is a subject.—The objector.

[2] And, therefore, it may be both Subject and object as suggested by the objector. [3] Pure Consciousness. It can never become an object. For an object is always the non-Self.

[4] The objector means that the Self possessed of the qualities of effort, desire, etc. may be a subject with certain qualities and an object with others. [5] Br. U., 2. 4. 12.

[6] Even according to the assumption, therefore, one conscious part cannot make the other conscious part its object ; nor can we imagine that there may be a non-conscious part in consciousness.

dividing line (dividing It into two categories viz., subject and obiect) in the Self, It cannot illumine Itself. For It is of a homogeneous conscious nature.

यद्धर्मा यः पदार्थो न तस्यैवेयात्स कर्मताम् ।
न ह्यात्मानं दहत्यग्निस्तथा नैव प्रकाशयेत् ॥ १३ ॥

13. Nothing[1] can be an object of its own quality. For fire does not burn or illumine itself.

एतेनैवात्मनात्मनो ग्रहो बुद्धेर्निराकृतः ।
अंशोऽप्येवं समत्वाद्धि निर्भेदत्वान्न युज्यते ॥ १४ ॥

14. The doctrine of the Buddhist that the intellect[2] is perceived by itself is refuted by this. Similarly,[3] the assumption of parts in the Self is also unreasonable. For It is of a homogeneous nature without having a dividing line in It.

शून्यतापि न युक्ता वै बुद्धेरन्येन दृश्यता ।
युक्ताऽतो घटवत्तस्याः प्राक्सिद्धेश्च विकल्पतः ॥ १५ ॥

15. The doctrine of the void (Nihilism) is[4] also not reasonable as it must be accepted that the intellect is witnessed like a jar by another i.e., the Self. For the

[1] The Self is, therefore, not the object of knowledge which is supposed by some to be a quality of the Self.
[2] There is no Self other than the intellect according to the Buddhists.
[3] Like the assumption that the Self is both subject and object. See verses 10—13 and footnotes.
[4] Like the doctrine that the intellect is the Self.

Self exists before[1] the intellect comes[2] into (apparent) existence.

अविकल्पं तदस्त्येव यत्पूर्वं स्याद्विकल्पतः ।
विकल्पोत्पत्तिहेतुत्वाद्यत्तस्यैव तु कारणम् ॥ १६ ॥

16. (Whatever[3] is pervaded by anything[4] is an effect of that thing, the cause.) Itself uncaused the cause[5] producing effects (such as, the intellect[6] etc.) must, therefore have an existence invariably anterior to that of the effect.

अज्ञानं कल्पनामूलं संसारस्य नियामकम् ।
हित्वात्मानं परं ब्रह्म विद्यान्मुक्तं सदाभयम् ॥ १७ ॥

17. Discarding Ignorance,[7] the root of all superimposition and the controller of transmigratory existence, one should know the Self to be the Supreme *Brahman* which is always free and devoid of fear.

जाग्रत्स्वप्नौ तयोर्बीजं सुषुप्ताख्यं तमोमयम् ।
अन्योन्यस्मिन्नसत्त्वाच्च नास्तीत्येतत्त्रयं त्यजेत् ॥ १८ ॥

18. (Transmigratory existence consists of) waking and dream. Their root is deep sleep consisting of Ignorance. No one of these three states has a real existence because each goes out of existence when another

[1] E.g., in deep sleep. [2] In waking and dream.
[3] E.g., an earthen jar. [4] E.g., earth. [5] The Self.
[6] Pervaded by (the reflection of) Existence, the Self. The Self must, therefore, have an existence anterior to that of everything. Hence nihilism cannot be accepted.
[7] Superimposed and therefore unreal.

remains in it. One should, therefore, give up[1] all these three states.

आत्मबुद्धिमनश्चक्षुरालोकार्थादिसंकरात् ।
भ्रान्तिः स्यादात्मकर्मेति क्रियाणां संनिपाततः ॥ १९ ॥
निमीलोन्मीलने स्थाने वायव्ये तेन चक्षुषः ।
प्रकाशत्वान्मनस्येवं बुद्धौ न स्वतः प्रकाशतः ॥ २० ॥

19, 20. Just as the closing and opening of the eye-lids, connected with the vital force and not with the eye, are mistaken for the properties of the eye which is of the nature of light, and just as motion, not a property of the mind and the intellect, is wrongly attributed to them which are also of the same nature[2]; so, the Self, (though really not an agent,) is mistaken for one because actions arise when the body, the intellect, the mind, the eye, light, objects, etc. coexist with It.

संकल्पाध्यवसायौ तु मनोबुद्ध्योर्यथा क्रमात् ।
नेतरेतरधर्मत्वं सर्वं चात्मनि कल्पितम् ॥ २१ ॥

21. The peculiar characteristic of the mind is reflection and that of the intellect is determination, and not *vice versa*. Everything is superimposed on the Self.

स्थानावच्छेददृष्टिः स्यादिन्द्रियाणां तदात्मनाम् ।
गता धीस्तां हि पश्यञ्ज्ञो देहमात्र इवेक्ष्यते ॥ २२ ॥

[1] I.e., one should know that they do not exist in the Self or anywhere else like a snake in a rope-snake when the rope is known.

[2] For they are instruments of knowledge.

22. Organs are (thought to be not all-pervading[1] but) limited by their particular appendages (which are in the body). The intellect gets identified with the organs (and hence with the body). Illumining the intellect, therefore, the Self appears to be of the same size as the body.[2]

क्षणिकं हि तदत्यर्थं धर्ममात्रं निरन्तरम् ।
सादृश्याद्दीपवत्तद्धीस्तच्छान्तिः पुरुषार्थता ॥ २३ ॥

23. (Objection). Both knowledge and its objects are extremely momentary (i.e., perishable by nature every moment). They are appearances only (without any permanent reality for a substratum) and are continually being produced. Just as a lamp (of the preceding moment) appears to be the same (in the succeeding moment) on account of similarity, so, both the objects and the subjects of the preceding and the succeeding moments (wrongly) appear to be identical on account of similarity. The goal of human life is the removal of this idea (of the continuity in knowledge and its objects and the removal of the indiscrimination to which it is due[3]).

स्वाकारान्यावभासं च येषां रूपादि विद्यते ।
येषां नास्ति ततश्चान्यत्पूर्वासंगतिरुच्यते ॥ २४ ॥

24. (Reply). According to one school of these philosophers colour etc. (external things) which are objects of knowledge exist. According to another

[1] As they do not function outside the body.
[2] Jainas hold this view.
[3] The verse states the doctrine of the Buddhists.

school[1] external objects other than knowledge do not exist. The unreasonableness of the former school is now going to be described.[2]

बाह्याकारत्वतो ज्ञप्तेः स्मृत्यभावः सदा क्षणात् ।
क्षणिकत्वाच्च संस्कारं नैवाधत्ते क्वचित्तु धीः ॥ २५ ॥
आधारस्याप्यसत्त्वाच्च तुल्यतानिर्निमित्ततः ।
स्थाने वा क्षणिकत्वस्य हानं स्यान्न तदिष्यते ॥ २६ ॥

25, 26. (According to this school) knowledge has to be admitted to be identical[3] with external things; and everything[4] being momentary and the intellect, the receptacle in which the impressions of memory are to be retained being non-existent[5] (at the time of receiving the impressions) there will always be the absence of memory. Being momentary, (according to them) the intellect never retains the impressions (of memory). (Again recognition is said to be due to a misconception of similarity but) there is no cause[6] of similarity (between the preceding and the succeeding moments[7]). (If, on the other hand, a witness perceiving both the moments be admitted) the doctrine of momentariness is abandoned. But that is not desirable.

भ्रान्तेश्चाप्यसिद्धत्वात्साधनोक्तिरनर्थिका ।
एकैकस्मिन्समाप्तत्वाद्भ्रान्तेरन्यानपेक्षता ॥ २७ ॥

[1] Idealists. [2] There is still another School according to which there are neither knowledge nor its objects. They are Nihilists.
[3] In that case their doctrine would be the same as that of the Idealists. [4] Both subjects and objects. [5] Because momentary.
[6] E.g. parts, qualities etc. Beginning from here the arguments are also against the idealists. [7] Phenomena belonging to the moments.

27. The teaching of a means to the attainment of the end (viz., the bringing to an end of the idea of continuity in knowledge and its object) becomes useless. For it requires no effort to be accomplished. As all phenomena exist only for a moment[1] the coming to an end of the said continuity does not depend on anything else.

अपेक्षा यदि भिन्नेऽपि परसंतान इष्यताम् ।
सर्वार्थे क्षणिके कस्मिंस्तथाप्यन्यानपेक्षता ॥ २८ ॥

28. If, (according to you,) the effect depends on the cause though unconnected with it you have to accept dependence on a series[2] which is quite foreign.[3] (If you say) "Though all things, i.e. causes and effects, are momentary some effects depend on some fixed causes," still nothing can depend on anything else (according to your doctrine of momentariness).

तुल्यकालसमुद्भूतावितरेतरयोगिनौ ।
योगाच्च संस्कृतो यस्तु सोऽन्यं हीक्षितुमर्हति ॥ २९ ॥

29. That particular one of two[4] things existing at the same time and connected with each other is fit to depend on the other owing to whose connection it is benefited.[5]

[1] The ideas of continuity and indiscrimination also being momentary there is no effort necessary to remove them.
[2] Each phenomenon continually produced and destroyed every moment and produced again is known to be a series.
[3] E.g., in order to be produced, curd may depend on sand instead of milk. [4] E.g., a sprout and a cloud. [5] Here ends the refutation of those who hold the doctrine of momentariness.

मृषाध्यासस्तु यत्र स्यात्तन्नाशस्तत्र नो मतः ।
सर्वनाशो भवेद्यस्य मोक्षः कस्य फलं वद ॥ ३० ॥

30. Our doctrine is that there is false superimposition on the Self and its negation in the same Self. Please[1] tell me who will attain liberation, the result of Knowledge according to you who hold that all (i.e. both the superimposed and the substratum) are annihilated.

अस्ति तावत्स्वयं नाम ज्ञानं वात्मान्यदेव वा ।
भावाभावज्ञतस्तस्य नाभावस्त्वधिगम्यते ॥ ३१ ॥

31. That oneself exists is undoubted. You may call it Knowledge, Self or whatever[2] you like. But Its non-existence cannot be admitted as It is the Witness of all things existing and non-existing.[3]

येनाधिगम्यतेऽभावस्तत्सत्स्यात्तन्न चेद्भवेत् ।
भावाभावानभिज्ञत्वं लोकस्य स्यान्न चेष्यते ॥ ३२ ॥

32. That by which the non-existence of things is witnessed must be real. All would be ignorant of the existence and non-existence of things if that were not the case. Therefore yours is a position[2] which cannot be accepted.

सदसत्सदसच्चेति विकल्पात्प्राग्यदिष्यते ।
तदद्वैतं समत्वात्तु नित्यं चान्यद्विकल्पितात् ॥ ३३ ॥

33. That which must be admitted to exist before the deliberation about existence, non-existence or both

[1] Refutation of Nihilism. [2] A void.
[3] The author's doctrine, verses 31—44.

is One without a second as there cannot be a cause of diversity (before there is any superimposition on It). It must be eternal and different from what is superimposed.

विकल्पोद्भवतोऽसत्त्वं स्वप्नदृश्यवदिष्यताम् ।
द्वैतस्य प्रागसत्त्वाच्च सदसत्त्वादिकल्पनात् ॥ ३४ ॥

34. Accept duality as unreal. For it comes to exist by way of superimposition like dream objects and does [1] not exist before [2] the deliberation about its existence, non-existence, etc.

वाचारम्भणशास्त्राच्च विकाराणां ह्यभावता ।
मृत्योः स मृत्युमित्यादेर्मम मायेति च स्मृतेः ॥ ३५ ॥

35. All the modifications (of the Primeval Cause) are known to be unreal according to the scriptures which say that they have 'words [3] only for their support' and that 'he [4] dies again and again' and so on. The *Smriti* also says 'My [5] *Mâyâ* (is difficult to be get rid of').

विशुद्धिश्चात एवास्य विकल्पाच्च विलक्षणः ।
उपादेयो न हेयोऽत आत्मा नान्यैरकल्पितः ॥ ३६ ॥

36, The Self is, therefore,[6] pure and is of a nature contrary to that of what is superimposed. Hence It can neither be accepted nor rejected. It is [7] not superimposed on anything else.

[1] There is no evidence that duality exists when unknown. See Pra. U., 4. 7. 8.
[2] E.g., in deep Sleep.
[3] Chh. U., 6. 1. 4—6.
[4] Br. U., 4. 4. 19.
[5] Bh. Gîtâ, 7. 14.
[6] As all duality is unreal.
[7] Because It is the ultimate substratum of all superimposition.

अप्रकाशो यथाऽऽदित्ये नास्ति ज्योतिःस्वभावतः ।
नित्यबोधस्वरूपत्वान्नाज्ञानं तद्वदात्मनि ॥ ३७ ॥

37. Just as there is no darkness in the sun as it is of the nature of light only, so, there is no Ignorance in the Self as It is of the nature of eternal Knowledge.

तथाऽविक्रियरूपत्वान्नावस्थान्तरमात्मनः ।
अवस्थान्तरवत्त्वे हि नाशोऽस्य स्यान्न संशयः ॥ ३८ ॥

38. Similarly, the Self has no change of states as It is of a changeless nature. It would, no doubt, be destructible if It underwent any change.

मोक्षोऽवस्थान्तरं यस्य कृतकः स चलो ह्यतः ।
न संयोगो वियोगो वा मोक्षो युक्तः कथंचन ॥ ३९ ॥
संयोगस्याप्यनित्यत्वाद्वियोगस्य तथैव च ।
गमनागमने चैव स्वरूपं तु न हीयते ॥ ४० ॥
स्वरूपस्यानिमित्तत्वात्सनिमित्ता हि चापरे ।
अनुपात्तं स्वरूपं हि स्वेनात्यक्तं तथैव च ॥ ४१ ॥

39—41. Liberation becomes artificial and therefore transitory according to the philosopher who holds that it is a change of one state into another (on the part of the Self). Again it is not reasonable that it is a union (with *Brahman*) or a separation (from Nature). As both union and separation are transitory Liberation cannot consist of the individual Self going to *Brahman* or of *Brahman* coming to it. But the Self,[1] one's own

[1] That the Self Itself is Liberation is the conclusion.

real nature is never destroyed. For It is uncaused and cannot be accepted or rejected by oneself (or by others) while other things (e.g., states etc.) are caused.

स्वरूपत्वान्न सर्वस्य त्यक्तुं शक्यो ह्यनन्यतः ।
ग्रहीतुं वा ततो नित्योऽविषयत्वात्पृथक्त्वतः ॥ ४२ ॥

42. As It is the Self of every thing, not different from anything and not an object like a thing separate from It the Self cannot be accepted or rejected. It is, therefore, eternal.

आत्मार्थत्वाच्च सर्वस्य नित्य आत्मैव केवलः ।
त्यजेत्तस्मात्क्रियाः सर्वाः साधनैः सह मोक्षवित् ॥ ४३ ॥

43. Everything (transitory) is for the experience of the Self which is eternal and free from all adjuncts. (Liberation is, therefore, nothing but being established in one's own Self.) As it is so, one aspiring after liberation should renounce all (Vedic) actions with their accessories.

आत्मलाभः परो लाभ इति शास्त्रोपपत्तयः ।
अलाभोऽन्यात्मलाभस्तु त्यजेत्तस्मादनात्मताम् ॥ ४४ ॥

44. To know the real Self[1] to be one's own is the greatest attainment according to the scriptures and reasoning. To know wrongly the non-Self such as, the ego etc. to be the Self is no attainment at all. One, therefore, should renounce this misconception of taking the non-Self for the Self.

[1] *Brahman*, the Universal Self.

गुणानां समभावस्य भ्रंशो न ह्युपपद्यते ।
अविद्यादेः प्रसुप्तत्वान्न चान्यो हेतुरुच्यते ॥ ४५ ॥

45. The deviation of the *Gunas*[1] from the state of equilibrium (which they have during the dissolution of the universe with their consequent evolution) is not reasonable. For no causes (of this transformation) are admitted inasmuch as, (according to these philosophers,[2]) Ignorance is then merged, (individual souls, *Purushas*, as they are called, are always spectators only and *Iswara* is not admitted).[3]

इतरेतरहेतुत्वे प्रवृत्तिः स्यात्सदा न वा ।
नियमो न प्रवृत्तीनां गुणेष्वात्मनि वा भवेत् ॥ ४६ ॥

46. If the *Gunas* be the causes of their mutual change there will always be change or none at all. (If one argues that there cannot be a continuous transformation in the *Gunas* as creation, maintenance and dissolution are known to come one after another, still) there will be no regulating cause of the modifications of the *Gunas* acting either on the *Purushas*[4] or on the *Gunas*; (and no other categories are admitted in the Sânkhya philosophy).

विशेषो मुक्तबद्धानां तादर्थ्ये न च युज्यते ।
अर्थार्थिनोस्त्वसंबन्धो नार्थी ज्ञो नेतरोऽपि वा ॥ ४७ ॥

[1] *Sattva, rajas* and *tamas*, the three constituent essences of the material cause of the universe called the "*Prakriti*" or "*Pradhâna*" in the Sânkhya philosophy. [2] The Sânkhyas.
[3] Refutation of the Sânkhya doctrine: verses 45—50.
[4] *Purushas* are immutable.

47. If, (as admitted,) the *Prakriti* or *Pradhâna* work for (the bondage and the liberation of) the *Purushas* there will be no distinction [1] between the bound and the liberated. Moreover, there is no relation between what is desired (i.e., liberation) and one who desires it as the *Purusha* has no desire at all, neither the other, i.e., the *Prakriti*.[2]

प्रधानस्य च पारार्थ्यं पुरुषस्याविकारतः ।
न युक्तं सांख्यशास्त्रेऽपि विकारेऽपि न युज्यते ॥ ४८ ॥

48. As the *Purusha* is changeless it is not reasonable according to the *Sânkhya* philosophy also [3] that the *Prakriti* can work for it. Even admitting change [4] (in the *Purusha*) it is unreasonable (that the *Prakriti* is of any service or disservice to it).

संबन्धानुपपत्तेश्च प्रकृतेः पुरुषस्य च ।
मिथोऽयुक्तं तदर्थत्वं प्रधानस्याचितित्वतः ॥ ४९ ॥

49. As there can reasonably be no mutual relation between the *Prakriti* and the *Purusha* and as the *Prakriti* is non-conscious it is unreasonable that the *Prakriti* can render any service to the *Purusha*.

क्रियोत्पत्तौ विनाशित्वं ज्ञानमात्रे च पूर्ववत् ।
निर्निमित्ते त्वनिर्मोक्षः प्रधानस्य प्रसज्यते ॥ ५० ॥

[1] For all *Purushas* will be bound or all liberated as the same *Prakriti* works for all *Purushas* at the same time.

[2] For it is non-conscious. [3] Like other non-vedic systems of philosophy outside the pale of the *Vedas*. [4] In that case the *Purusha* will have to be admitted to be transitory and not, as it is supposed, the lord of the *Prakriti* which is admitted to be eternal.

50. If any action is admitted (in the *Purusha*) it must be perishable. If (it is argued that) the action in the *Purusha* is of the nature of Knowledge[1] only we meet with the difficulty spoken of before. If uncaused action in the *Prakriti* be admitted it becomes unreasonable that there can be liberation.

न प्रकाश्यं यथोष्णत्वं ज्ञानेनैवं सुखादयः ।
एकनीडत्वतोऽग्राह्याः स्युः कणादादिवर्त्मनाम् ॥ ५१ ॥

51. Pleasure[2] etc. cannot, as held by the followers of Kanada, be the objects of knowledge ; for they are the properties of the same substance,[3] just as heat, (a property of fire) cannot be revealed by light.[4]

युगपत्समवेतत्वं सुखविज्ञानयोरपि ।
मनोयोगैकहेतुत्वादग्राह्यत्वं सुखस्य च ॥ ५२ ॥

52. Pleasure and knowledge cannot come together as each of them is (separately) caused by the contact of the mind (with the self). Therefore pleasure cannot be the object (of knowledge).

तथान्येषां च भिन्नत्वाद्युगपज्जन्म नेष्यते ।
गुणानां समवेतत्वं ज्ञानं चेन्न विशेषणात् ॥ ५३ ॥

[1] If knowledge is Pure Consciousness the *Purusha* cannot be the lord of the *Prakriti*, (see footnote 4, verse 48 above,) but if it be phenomenal, *Purusha* becomes perishable.

[2] Refutation of Kanâda's Vaiseshika doctrine : verses 51—66.

[3] The individual soul. According to this philosophy souls have qualities, such as knowledge, pain, pleasure, etc.

[4] Another property of fire.

53. As other qualities also are different from one another (like knowledge and pleasure) they cannot be produced at the same time. If it be contended that the knowledge of the qualities is nothing but their coming in contact with one and the same self, we say 'No'; for they are qualified[1] by knowledge.

ज्ञानेनैव विशेषत्वाज्ज्ञानाप्यत्वं स्मृतेस्तथा ।
सुखं ज्ञातं मयेत्येवं तवाज्ञानात्मकत्वतः ॥ ५४ ॥

54. Pleasure etc. are surely objects of knowledge because they are qualified by it and also on account of the memory, 'pleasure was *known* by me.' (Moreover, they cannot be known by being connected with the self only and not with knowledge.) For the self is non-conscious[2] as it is different from knowledge according to you.

सुखादेर्नात्मधर्मत्वमात्मनस्तेऽविकारतः ।
भेदादन्यस्य कस्मान्न मनसो वाऽविशेषतः ॥ ५५ ॥

55. Pleasure etc. cannot be the qualities of the soul as it is changeless[3] according to you. Moreover, why should pleasure etc. of one soul not be there in other souls and also in the mind as difference is common[4]?

[1] E.g., we say 'known pleasure', 'known pain', etc.

[2] Whatever is different from knowledge must be non-conscious. And non-conscious pleasure, pain, etc. cannot be known when in contact with a non-conscious Self.

[3] For souls, according to them, are all of an infinitely extended nature and are, therefore, changeless.

[4] Just as pleasure etc. are different from one soul they are so from other souls and from the mind.

स्यान्मालाऽपरिहार्या तु ज्ञानं चेज्ज्ञेयतां व्रजेत् ।
युगपद्वापि चोत्पत्तिरभ्युपेतात इष्यते ॥ ५६ ॥

56. If knowledge be the object of a second[1] knowledge a *regressus ad infinitum* is inevitable. If, however, a simultaneous production (of the two knowledges from one single contact of the mind with the self) be admitted you must accept (the simultaneous production of colour, taste, smell, etc. from the same contact).

अनवस्थान्तरत्वाच्च बन्धो नात्मनि विद्यते ।
नाशुद्धिश्चाप्यसङ्गत्वादसङ्गो हीति च श्रुतेः ॥ ५७ ॥

57. There is no bondage in the Self as there is no change of condition in It. There is no impurity in the Self inasmuch as It is 'unattached' as the *Sruti*[2] says.

सूक्ष्मैकागोचरेभ्यश्च न लिप्यत इति श्रुतेः ॥ ५८ ॥

58. (The Self is eternally pure) as It is beyond the mind and speech, one only and without any attributes, as the *Sruti*[3] says " It does not get attached."

एवं तर्हि न मोक्षोऽस्ति बन्धाभावात्कथंचन ।
शास्त्रानर्थक्यमेव स्यान्न बुद्धेर्भ्रान्तिरिष्यते ।
बन्धो, मोक्षश्च तन्नाशः स यथोक्तो न चान्यथा ॥ ५९ ॥

59. (Objection). If this be so, in the absence of bondage there cannot be any liberation and the scriptures are, therefore, useless.

[1] It is admitted by the Vaiseshikas.
[2] Br. U., 3. 9. 26.
[3] Kath. U., 5. 11.

(Reply). No. Bondage is nothing but a delusion of the intellect; the removal of this delusion is liberation. Bondage is nothing but *what* has been described.[1]

बोधात्मज्योतिषा दीप्ता बोधमात्मनि मन्यते ।
बुद्धिर्नान्योऽस्ति बोद्धेति सेयं भ्रान्तिर्हि धीगता ॥ ६० ॥

60. Illumined by the light[2] of the Self, Pure Consciousness, the intellect (falsely) believes that it is itself conscious and that there is no one else which is so. This is delusion. It is in the intellect.

बोधस्यात्मस्वरूपत्वान्नित्यं तत्रोपचर्यते ।
अविवेकोऽप्यनाद्योऽयं संसारो नान्य इष्यते ॥ ६१ ॥

61. Consciousness which is of the nature of the eternal Self is superimposed[3] on the intellect. This indiscrimination is also beginningless (like the Ignorance to which it is due). This indiscrimination, and nothing else, is what is called transmigratory existence.

मोक्षस्तन्नाश एव स्यान्नान्यथानुपपत्तितः ।
येषां वस्त्वन्तरापत्तिर्मोक्षो नाशस्तु तैर्मतः ॥ ६२ ॥

62. The removal of this indiscrimination, and nothing else, is what is called liberation as all other conceptions of it are unreasonable. It is the destruction of the Self according to those who consider

[1] In verse 17 of this chapter. So the scriptures are not useless, as they teach the means to the removal of this delusion. See the following verse.
[2] The reflection of the Self.
[3] See foot-note 2, para 59, chapter II, prose part.

liberation[1] to be the change of the individual Self into a different Being.[2]

अवस्थान्तरमप्येवमविकारान्न युज्यते ।
विकारोऽवयवित्वं स्यात्ततो नाशो घटादिवत् ॥ ६३ ॥

63. Similarly, it is also not reasonable that liberation is a change of condition (on the part of the Self) as It is changeless. If, however, any change be assumed to exist in It, it must be admitted to consist of parts and so to be destructible like jars and other things.

तस्माद्भ्रान्तिरतोऽन्या हि बन्धमोक्षादिकल्पना: ।
सांख्यकाणादबौद्धानां मीमांसाहृतकल्पना: ॥ ६४ ॥
शास्त्रयुक्तिविहीनत्वान्नादर्तव्या: कदाचन ।
शक्यन्ते शतशो वक्तुं दोषास्तासां सहस्रश: ॥ ६५ ॥
अपि निर्दोषपत्तेश्च यान्यतोऽन्यानि चेत्यत: ।
त्यक्त्वातो ह्यन्यशास्त्रोक्तीर्मतिं कुर्याद्दृढां बुध: ॥ ६६ ॥
श्रद्धाभक्ती पुरस्कृत्य हित्वा सर्वमनार्जवम् ।
वेदान्तस्यैव तत्वार्थे व्यासस्याभिमतौ तथा ॥ ६७ ॥

64—67. Therefore the conception of bondage and liberation different from this is wrong. The conceptions of the Sânkhyas, the Kânâdas and the Buddhists about them are not tenable according to reason. They should never be accepted. For they are not supported by reason and the scriptures. Hundreds and thousands of errors on their part may be mentioned.

[1] See footnote 1, verse 41 above. [2] *Brahman*.

As the scriptures other than the *Vedas* have been condemned (in the ancient sacred tradition,[1]) "scriptures other than these," (they should not be accepted). A wise man should give up the teachings of such scriptures and all crookedness, and, with faith and devotion, should have a firm understanding of the true import of the *Vedântas* accepted by Vyâsa.[2]

इति प्रणुन्ना द्वयवादकल्पना निरात्मवादाश्च तथाहि युक्तितः ।
व्यपेतशङ्काः परवादतः स्थिरा मुमुक्षवो ज्ञानपथे स्युरित्युत ॥

68. False doctrines of dualism and those according to which the Self is not admitted have thus been refuted by reasoning, so that those who aspire after liberation may be steady in the path of Knowledge (described in the *Vedântas*) and be free from doubts arising from others' doctrines.

स्वसाक्षिकं ज्ञानमतीव निर्मलं विकल्पनाभ्यो विपरीतमद्वयम् ।
अवाप्य सम्यग्यदि निश्चितो भवेन्निरन्वयो निर्वृतिमेति शाश्वतीम् ॥

69. Having attained the extremely pure, non-dual Knowledge[3] which is Its own Witness and contrary to what is superimposed a man, perfectly convinced (of the Truth of the Self), becomes free from Ignorance and gets eternal peace.

[1] The tradition is this: Those learned ones who want pure religion should doubt about the truth of the various scriptures found in the world, which are other than the *Vedas* etc.

[2] Bâdarâyana, the author of the *Vedânta* Aphorisms.

[3] Knowledge of *Brahman* that leads to liberation immediately.

इदं रहस्यं परमं परायणं व्यपेतदोषैरभिमानवर्जितैः ।
समीक्ष्य कार्या मतिरार्जवे सदा न तत्त्वदृक्स्वान्यमतिर्हि कश्चन ॥

70. Having a firm grasp of this secret Knowledge,[1] the Supreme Goal, and being free from defects and vanity people should always fix their minds on *Brahman* which is always the same. For no man who knows *Brahman* to be different from himself is a knower of Truth.

अनेकजन्मान्तरसंचितैर्नरो विमुच्यतेऽज्ञाननिमित्तपातकैः ।
इदं विदित्वा परमं हि पावनं न लिप्यते व्योम इवेह कर्मभिः ॥

71. When he acquires this Knowledge, the supreme purifier a man becomes free from all merit and demerit produced by Ignorance and accumulated in many other lives. He, like the ether, does not get attached to actions in this world.

प्रशान्तचित्ताय जितेन्द्रियाय च प्रहीणदोषाय यथोक्तकारिणे ।
गुणान्वितायानुगताय सर्वदा प्रदेयमेतत्सततं मुमुक्षवे ॥ ७२ ॥

72. This (Knowledge) should be imparted only to him whose mind has been pacified, who has controlled his senses and is freed[2] from all defects, who has practised the duties (enjoined by the scriptures) and is possessed of good qualities,[3] who is always obedient (to the teacher) and aspires after liberation only.

[1] That the Self is *Brahman*.
[2] By the performance of *Vedic* actions without a desire for their results. [3] Such as, learning, humility and truth.

परस्य देहे न यथाभिमानिता परस्य तद्वत्परमार्थमीक्ष्य च ।
इदं हि विज्ञानमतीव निर्मलं संप्राप्य मुक्तोऽथ भवेच्च सर्वतः ॥

73. Just as one is free from the ideas of 'me' and 'mine' in respect of others' bodies, so, one becomes free from those ideas (in respect of one's own body) when one knows the supreme Truth. One becomes immediately liberated in all respects on attaining this very pure Knowledge.

नहीह लाभोऽभ्यधिकोऽस्ति कश्चन
स्वरूपलाभात्स इतो हि नान्यतः ।
न देयमैन्द्रादपि राज्यतोऽधिकं
स्वरूपलाभं त्वपरीक्ष्य यत्नतः ॥ ७४ ॥

74. There is no attainment higher than that of Self-knowledge in the worlds of men and gods. It arises from nothing but the *Vedantas.* This Knowledge of the Self, superior even to the kingdom of Indra, should, therefore, not be imparted to any person without examining[1] him carefully.

[1] See para II, chapter I, prose portion.

सम्यङ्मतिप्रकरणम् ॥ १७ ॥

CHAPTER XVII

RIGHT KNOWLEDGE

आत्मा ज्ञेयः परो ह्यात्मा यस्मादन्यन्न विद्यते ।
सर्वज्ञः सर्वदृक् शुद्धस्तस्मै ज्ञेयात्मने नमः ॥ १ ॥

1. The Self to be known[1] is beyond everything as there exists nothing else. I bow down to that pure, all-knowing and omniscient One which is to be known.

पदवाक्यप्रमाणज्ञैर्दीपभूतैः प्रकाशितम् ।
ब्रह्म वेदरहस्यं यैस्तान्नित्यं प्रणतोऽस्म्यहम् ॥ २ ॥

2. I always bow down to those (teachers) who are conversant with words, sentences and sources of Knowledge and who, like lamps, have shown clearly to us *Brahman*, the secret of the *Vedas*.

यद्वाक्सूर्यांशुसंपातप्रनष्टध्वान्तकल्मषः ।
प्रणम्य तान्गुरून्वक्ष्ये ब्रह्मविद्याविनिश्चयम् ॥ ३ ॥

[1] Not as an object. See verse 1, chapter II, part II.

3. I bow down to my teacher whose words fell (into my ears) and destroyed Ignorance (in me) like the sun's rays falling on darkness and destroying it. I shall now state the right conclusion about the Knowledge of *Brahman*.

आत्मलाभात्परो नान्यो लाभः कश्चन विद्यते ।
यदर्था वेदवादाश्च स्मार्ताश्चापि तु याः क्रियाः ॥ ४ ॥

4. There is no other attainment higher than that of the Self. For that is the purpose for which the teachings of the *Vedas*, the *Smritis* and the actions[1] (described in the work-portion of the *Vedas*) are there.

आत्मार्थोऽपि हि यो लाभः सुखायेष्टो विपर्ययः ।
आत्मलाभः परः प्रोक्तो नित्यत्वाद्ब्रह्मवेदिभिः ॥ ५ ॥

5. The acquisition[2] considered to be a source of happiness on the part of oneself[3] produces the opposite result[4] also. The Knowers of *Brahman* say that the greatest acquisition is that of the Self as It is eternal.[5]

स्वयं लब्धस्वभावत्वाल्लाभस्तस्य न चान्यतः ।
अन्यापेक्षस्तु यो लाभः सोऽन्यदृष्टिसमुद्भवः ॥ ६ ॥

6. Of the nature of being always[6] attained the Self does not depend on anything else in order to be

[1] They lead to Knowledge through the purification of the mind.
[2] Such as, fame, wealth and so on. [3] Br. U., 1. 4. 8. and 2. 4. 5.
[4] Pain ; owing to the loss of such acquisition.
[5] See verses 43 and 44, chapter 16. [6] For it is the Self.

acquired. The acquisition that depends on other things (e.g., effort etc.) is due to Ignorance (and so vanishes when the means to which it is due vanish).

अन्यदृष्टिस्त्वविद्या स्यात्तन्नाशो मोक्ष उच्यते ।
ज्ञानेनैव तु सोऽपि स्याद्विरोधित्वान्न कर्मणा ॥ ७ ॥

7. The conception (of the existence) of the non-Self is Ignorance the destruction of which is known to be liberation. This destruction is possible by means of Knowledge only which is incompatible with Ignorance. (Compatible with Ignorance) actions cannot destroy it.

कर्मकार्यस्त्वनित्यः स्यादविद्याकामकारणः ।
प्रमाणं वेद एवात्र ज्ञानस्याधिगमे स्मृतः ॥ ८ ॥

8. That actions produced by desires caused by Ignorance give rise to perishable results[1] (and, that Knowledge produces an imperishable result,[2]) are known on the evidence of the *Vedas.*

ज्ञानैकार्थपरत्वात्तं वाक्यमेकं ततो विदुः ।
एकत्वं ह्यात्मनो ज्ञेयं वाक्यार्थप्रतिपत्तितः ॥ ९ ॥

9. The learned know the *Vedas*[3] to be one continuous whole the only purpose of which is to demonstrate one thing viz., Knowledge inasmuch as the

[1] E.g., higher regions. See Chh. U., 8. 1. 6.
[2] Liberation which is the Self Itself and therefore imperishable.
[3] The work and the Knowledge portions of the *Vedas.* The work portion leads an aspirant performing *Vedic* actions through the purification of the mind, to Self-knowledge.

13

oneness of the Self[1] is to be known by the understanding of the *Vedic* sentences.[2]

वाच्यभेदात्तु तद्भेदः कल्प्यो वाच्यो हि तच्छ्रुतेः ।
अयं त्वेतत्ततः प्रोक्तं रूपं नाम च कर्म च ॥ १० ॥

10. (One may object that *Brahman* and the individual Self are different from each other as they are the meanings of two words which are not synonymous. The objection is not reasonable) inasmuch as one has to know the difference between the words from that between their meanings and the difference between their meanings from that between the words. (Therefore the objector is led to the fallacy of reciprocal dependence. So no difference between them can be accepted, there being no *Vedic* evidence.) (Objection.) As the *Sruti* states three things besides the Self viz., names, forms and actions (it evidently supports the existence of things other than the Self).

असदेतत्त्रयं तस्मादन्योन्येन हि कल्पितम् ।
कृतो वर्णो यथा शब्दाच्छ्रुतोऽन्यत्र धिया बहिः ॥ ११ ॥
दृष्टं चापि यथारूपं बुद्धेः शब्दाय कल्पते ।
एवमेतज्जगत्सर्वं भ्रान्तिबुद्धिविकल्पितम् ॥ १२ ॥

11, 12. (Reply.) As they are inter-dependent[3] like a painting[4] and a description[4] of it those three are unreal.

[1] Oneness of the Self with *Brahman*. [2] Such as, 'Thou art That', 'I am *Brahman*' and so on. [3] Br. U., 1. 6. 3.

[4] For we paint a picture (say, of a god) with the help of imagination when we hear a word (viz., the name of the god). Again, similarly, we give a name to a painting when we see it, say, on a wall.

So the whole of the universe exists only for a deluded intellect.

असदेतत्ततो युक्तं सच्चिन्मात्रं न कल्पितम् ।
वेदश्चापि स एवाद्यो वेद्यं चान्यत्तु कल्पितम् ॥ १३ ॥

13. It is, therefore, reasonable that these three are unreal. Existence-Knowledge only is real. (Existing prior to everything) It is both the knower[1] and the known. It is the other things (i.e. name, form and action) only that are unreal.

येन वेत्ति स वेदः स्यात्स्वप्ने सर्वं तु मायया ।
येन पश्यति तच्चक्षुः शृणोति श्रोत्रमुच्यते ॥ १४ ॥
येन स्वप्नगतो वक्ति सा वाग्घ्राणं तथैव च ।
रसनस्पर्शने चैव मनश्चान्यत्तथेन्द्रियम् ॥ १५ ॥

14, 15. Existence-Knowledge[2] through which all things in dream are known is the knower.[3] It is the same entity that is the known[4] in dream by *Maya*. It is the same Consciousness through which one sees, hears, speaks, smells, tastes, touches and thinks in that state is respectively called[5] the eye, the ear, the larynx, the auditive organ, the tongue, the organ of touch and the mind. Similary, It is the same Consciousness that becomes in dream the other organs[6] also functioning variously.

[1] How It is both the knower and the known is explained in the next two verses. [2] See Br. U., 4. 3. 6.
[3] For there is no other illuminator there.
[4] For there are no objects of knowledge in dream. See Br. U., 4. 3. 10. [5] See verse 54 of this chapter.
[6] See the next verse and note 1 on it.

कल्प्योपाधिभिरेवैतद्भिन्नं ज्ञानमनेकधा ।
आधिभेदाद्यथा भेदो मणेरेकस्य जायते ॥ १६ ॥

16. Just as the same jewel assumes different colours owing to its proximity to different (coloured) things, so, this Pure Consciousness assumes different forms[1] on account of various adjuncts which are superimposed on It (in dream).

जाग्रतश्च यथा भेदो ज्ञानस्यास्य विकल्पितः ।
बुद्धिस्थं व्याकरोत्यर्थं भ्रान्त्या तृष्णोद्भवक्रियः ॥ १७ ॥

17. As in dream, so in the waking state different forms[1] are superimposed on this Consciousness. It manifests[2] the objects of the intellect when it performs actions produced by desires due to delusion.

स्वप्ने तद्वत्प्रबोधे यो बहिश्चान्तस्तथैव च ।
आलेख्याध्ययने यद्वत्तदन्योन्यधियोद्भवम् ॥ १८ ॥

18. The events in the waking state are similar to those in dream. The ideas of the interior and exterior in the former state is as unreal[3] as in the latter like reading[4] and writing[4] depending on each other.

यदायं कल्पयेद्भेदं तत्कामः सन्यथाक्रतुः ।
यत्कामस्तत्क्रतुर्भूत्वा कृतं यत्तत्प्रपद्यते ॥ १९ ॥

[1] The knower, the known and the instruments of knowledge.
[2] See G. K., 2. 13. [3] G. K., 2. 9. 10.
[4] Reading depends on a written page without which nothing can be read ; and writing also depends on reading as we first read and then write. So both of them are unreal as the sounds represented by written letters are all-pervasive and have no forms. Hence they can neither be really written nor read.

19. When the Self manifests different objects It desires to have them ; and accordingly there arises in It a determination (to acquire those objects). It then meets with (those particular results of) actions done according to particular desires followed by particular determinations.

अविद्याप्रभवं सर्वमसत्तस्मादिदं जगत् ।
तद्दृता दृश्यते यस्मात्सुषुप्ते न च गृह्यते ॥ २० ॥

20. Unperceived in deep sleep[1] but perceived (in waking and dream) by those only who are ignorant the whole of this universe[2] is an outcome of Ignorance and therefore unreal.

विद्याविद्ये श्रुतिप्रोक्ते एकत्वान्यधियौ हि नः ।
तस्मात्सर्वप्रयत्नेन शास्त्रे विद्या विधीयते ॥ २१ ॥

21. It is said in the *Sruti* that the consciousness of the oneness (of the individual Self and *Brahman*) is Knowledge, and that of a difference (between them) is Ignorance. Knowledge is, therefore,[3] demonstrated in the scriptures with great care.

चित्ते ह्यादर्शवद्यस्माच्छुद्धे विद्या प्रकाशते ।
यमैर्नित्यैश्च यज्ञैश्च तपोभिस्तस्य शोधनम् ॥ २२ ॥

22. When the mind becomes purified like a mirror Knowledge is revealed in it. Care should, therefore,

[1] Though there is Ignorance in deep sleep one is then not conscious of it. [2] Consisting of name, form and action.
[3] For without being demonstrated it does not arise.

be taken to purify the mind by यम (Yama[1]), नियम (Niyama[2]), sacrifices[3] and religious austerities.

शारीरादि तपः कुर्यात्तद्विशुद्ध्यर्थमुत्तमम् ।
मनआदिसमाधानं तत्तद्देहविशोषणम् ॥ २३ ॥

23. The best[4] austerities[5] regarding the body, the mind and speech should be practised in order to purify the mind. The controlling of the mind and the emaciating of the body should be undertaken.

मनसश्चेन्द्रियाणां च ह्यैकाग्र्यं परमं तपः ।
तज्ज्यायः सर्वधर्मेभ्यः स धर्मः पर उच्यते ॥ २४ ॥

24. The attainment of the onepointedness[6] of the mind and the senses is the best of austerities. It is superior to all religious duties and all other austerities.

दृष्टं जागरितं विद्यात्स्मृतं स्वप्ने तदेव तु ।
सुषुप्तं तदभावं च स्वमात्मानं परं पदम् ॥ २५ ॥

25. Sensuous perceptions are to be regarded as the waking state. Those very perceptions revealed in sleep as impressions constitute the dream state. The absence of perceptions and their impressions is known

[1] Speaking the truth, non-stealing, continence, non-injury and non-acceptance of gifts.
[2] External and internal cleanliness, contentment, study of the *Vedas* and meditation on God.
[3] Enjoined according to one's own caste and order of life, the result being offered to the Lord by the performer.
[4] Bh. Gîtâ, 17. 17.
[5] Bh. Gîtâ, 17. 14—16.
[6] Regarding *Brahman*.

to be deep sleep. (The witness of the three states) one's own Self should be regarded as the supreme Goal[1] to be realised.

सुषुप्त्याख्यं तमोऽज्ञानं बीजं स्वप्नप्रबोधयोः ।
स्वात्मबोधप्रदग्धं स्याद्बीजं दग्धं यथाऽभवम् ॥ २६ ॥

26. What is called deep sleep,[2] Darkness[3] or Ignorance is the seed[3] of the waking and dream states. It gets perfectly burnt by the fire of Self-knowledge (and it no more produces effects) like a burnt seed that does not germinate.

तदेवैकं त्रिधा ज्ञेयं मायाबीजं पुनः क्रमात् ।
मायाव्यात्माऽविकारोऽपि बहुधैको जलार्कवत् ॥ २७ ॥

27. That one seed, called *Mâyâ*, is evolved into the three states[4] which come one after another again and again. The Self, the Substratum of *Mâyâ*, though one only and immutable, appears to be many like reflections of the sun in water.

बीजं चैकं यथा भिन्नं प्राणस्वप्नादिभिस्तथा ।
स्वप्नजाग्रच्छरीरेषु तद्वदात्मा जलेन्दुवत् ॥ २८ ॥

28. Just as the one seed, (called *Mâyâ*) is regarded as different according to different states such as, the

[1] *Brahman.* [2] It is called Ignorance because the modifications of Ignorance are there in it.
[3] The word indicates a positive entity and hence it can be the material cause of the three states. (See the next verse.)
[4] Waking, dream and deep sleep.

undifferentiated,[1] dream, etc., so, the Self appears to be different in waking and dream bodies, (both individual and aggregate[2]) like reflections of the moon in water.

मायाहस्तिनमारुह्य मायाव्येको यथा व्रजेत् ।
आगच्छंस्तद्वदेवात्मा प्राणस्वप्नादिगोऽचलः ॥ २९ ॥

29. Just as a magician comes and goes on an elephant (created by his own magic), so, the Self, though devoid of all motion, appears to be undergoing conditions such as, the undifferentiated, dream, etc.

न हस्ती न तदारूढो मायाव्यन्यो यथास्थितः ।
न प्राणादि न तद्द्रष्टा तथा ज्ञोऽन्यः सदादृशिः ॥ ३० ॥

30. Just as (in the above example) there is no elephant nor its driver, but there stands the magician different from them, so, there are no undifferentiated etc. nor their knower. The Witness which is always of the nature of Pure Consciousness is different from them.

अबद्धचक्षुषो नास्ति माया मायाविनोऽपि वा ।
बद्धाक्षस्यैव सा मायाऽमायाव्येव ततो भवेत् ॥ ३१ ॥

31. There is no magic for the people of right vision nor for the magician himself. It is only for the people of clouded vision that magic exists. Hence one, not really a magician, (wrongly) appears to be so.

[1] Hiranyagarbha or the aggregate vital force before it is manifested.

[2] Just as the sea may be regarded as the aggregate of waves.

[So, it is the ignorant only that wrongly believe that *Brahman* is the wielder of *Mâyâ* which is equally non-existent both for men of Knowledge and for *Brahman*.]

साक्षाद्देवः स विज्ञेयः साक्षादात्मेति च श्रुतेः ।
भिद्यते हृदयग्रन्थिर्न चेदित्यादितः श्रुतेः ॥ ३२ ॥

32. The Self should be regarded as *Brahman* Itself in accordance with the *Srutis*, 'The Self[1] is immediate,' 'All[2] knots of the heart are torn asunder,' 'If[3] not' and so on.

अशब्दादित्वतो नास्य ग्रहणं चेन्द्रियैर्भवेत् ।
सुखादिभ्यस्तथान्यत्वाद्बुद्ध्या वापि कथं भवेत् ॥ ३३ ॥

33. (Objection.) It is not perceived by the senses as It is devoid of sound etc. Again how can It be perceived by the intellect as It is different from pleasure and so on ?

अदृश्योऽपि यथा राहुश्चन्द्रे बिम्बं यथाम्भसि ।
सर्वगोऽपि तथैवात्मा बुद्धावेव स गृह्यते ॥ ३४ ॥

34. (Reply.) Just as Râhu,[4] though invisible, is seen in the moon (during an eclipse) and the reflections (of the moon etc.) are seen in water, so, the Self, though omnipresent, is perceived in the intellect.

[1] Br. U., 3. 4. 1, 2 and 3. 5. 1. [2] Mu. U., 2. 2. 8. [3] Ke. U., 1. 5.

[4] The name of a *daitya* or demon who is supposed to seize the sun and moon and thus cause eclipses. Or the shadow of the earth and that of the moon falling on the moon and on the sun respectively during lunar and solar eclipses is what is known to be *Râhu*. See verse 40, chapter 18.

भानोर्बिम्बं यथा चौष्ण्यं जले दृष्टं न चाम्भसः ।
बुद्धौ बोधो न तद्धर्मस्तथैव स्याद्विधर्मतः ॥ ३५ ॥

35. Just as the reflection and the heat of the sun, found in water, do not belong to water, so, Consciousness, though perceived in the intellect, is not its quality ; for It is of a nature opposite to that of the intellect.

चक्षुर्युक्ता धियो वृत्तिर्या तां पश्यन्नलुप्तदृक् ।
दृष्टेर्द्रष्टा भवेदात्मा श्रुतेः श्रोता तथा भवेत् ॥ ३६ ॥
केवलां मनसो वृत्तिं पश्यन्मन्ता मतेरजः ।
विज्ञाताऽलुप्तशक्तित्वात्तथा शास्त्रं नहीत्यतः ॥ ३७ ॥

36, 37. The Self whose Consciousness never goes out of existence is called the Seer of seeing when it illumines the modification of the intellect connected with the eye, and similarly It is called the Hearer of hearing (and so on). The Unborn One is called the Thinker of thought when It illumines that modification of the mind which is independent of external objects. It is called the Knower as Its power of Consciousness never fails ; so the *Sruti*[1] says, "The Seeing of the Seer is not destroyed."

ध्यायतीत्यविकारित्वं तथा लेलायतीत्यपि ।
अत्र स्तेनेति शुद्धत्वं तथाऽनन्वागतं श्रुतेः ॥ ३८ ॥

38. That the Self is immutable is known from the *Srutis*, 'As[2] if It were at rest' and 'It[2] moves as it

[1] Br. U., 4. 3. 23—30 and verses 6—9, ch. 13 of this book.
[2] Br. U. 4. 3. 7.

were.' That It is pure is known from other *Srutis*, 'The thief[1] in this state' and 'Unattached.'[1]

शक्त्यलोपात्सुषुप्ते ज्ञस्तथा बोधेऽविकारतः ।
ज्ञेयस्यैव विशेषस्तु यत्र वेति श्रुतेर्वचः ॥ ३९ ॥

39. The Self is conscious even in deep sleep as well as in waking and dream as Its power of Consciousness never ceases to exist and as It is changeless. It is only in the objects of knowledge that there is a difference[2] (in dreamless sleep,) as the *Sruti*[3] says 'When there is.'

व्यवधानाद्धि पारोक्ष्यं लोकदृष्टेरनात्मनः ।
दृष्टेरात्मस्वरूपत्वात्प्रत्यक्षं ब्रह्म तत्स्मृतम् ॥ ४० ॥

40. The consciousness[4] of objects (which arises out of the functioning of the eye etc., the non-self,) is mediately known; for it depends on an intervening reflection of the Self (in order to be known). As Brahman is the Self of (phenomenal) consciousness It is immediately[5] known.

नहि दीपान्तरापेक्षा यद्वद्दीपप्रकाशने ।
बोधस्यात्मस्वरूपत्वान्न बोधोऽन्यस्तथेष्यते ॥ ४१ ॥

41. Just as a second lamp is not necessary in order to illumine a lamp, so, a second consciousness is not necessary to make known Pure Consciousness which is of the nature of the Self.

[1] Br. U., 4. 3. 22.
[2] In deep sleep the objects of Knowledge get merged in Ignorance. [3] Br. U., 4. 5. 15.
[4] Modifications of the mind reflecting Pure Consciousness.
[5] See verse 26, chapter 14.

विषयत्वं विकारित्वं नानात्वं वा नहीष्यते ।
न हेयो नाप्युपादेय आत्मा नान्येन वा ततः ॥ ४२ ॥

42. The Self is not an object (of knowledge). There is no change or manyness in It. It is, therefore, capable of neither being accepted nor rejected (by Itself or) by anyone else.[1]

सबाह्याभ्यन्तरोऽजीर्णो जन्ममृत्युजरातिगः ।
अहमात्मेति यो वेत्ति कुतोऽन्वेव बिभेति सः ॥ ४३ ॥

43. Why should a man have even the least fear who knows that he is the Self comprising the interior[2] and exterior,[2] beyond birth, decay, death and old age ?

प्रागेवैतद्विधेः कर्म वर्णित्वादेरपोहनात् ।
तदस्थूलादिशास्त्रेभ्यस्तत्त्वमेवेति निश्चयात् ॥ ४४ ॥

44. It is only before the negation of the Idea of caste[3] etc. on the evidence of the *Sruti*, 'Not[4] large' and before the ascertainment of the nature of the Self on the authority of the sentence, 'Thou art That' and also before the demonstration of the Self (to one) on the part of (the knowledge portion of) the *Vedas* that *Vedic* actions are to be performed (and not afterwards).

पूर्वदेहपरित्यागे जात्यादीनां प्रहाणतः ।
देहस्यैव तु जात्यादिस्तस्याप्येवं ह्यनात्मता ॥ ४५ ॥

[1] For no one else exists except the Self.
[2] The interior and exterior with reference to the body. The Self is the substratum of both the interior and exterior together with the body.
[3] They are conditions of fitness for *Vedic* actions.
[4] Br. U., 3. 8. 8.

45. Caste[1] etc. given up with the giving up of the previous body do belong to the body only (and not to the Self). For the very same reason (of being perishable) the body is also not the Self.

ममाहं चेत्यतोऽविद्या शरीरादिष्वनात्मसु ।
आत्मज्ञानेन हेया स्यादसुराणामिति श्रुतेः ॥ ४६ ॥

46. The conceptions of 'me' and 'mine' with regard to the non-Self, the body etc., are due to Ignorance and should be renounced by means of Self-knowledge as there is the *Sruti*,[2] 'of the Asuras.'[3]

दशाहाशौचकार्याणां पारिव्राज्ये निवर्तनम् ।
यथा, ज्ञानस्य संप्राप्तौ तद्वज्जात्यादिकर्मणाम् ॥ ४७ ॥

47. Just as the duty of observing defilement for ten days (following child birth or the death of a kinsman) is refrained from when one becomes a wandering religious mendicant ; so, the duties belonging to particular castes etc. come to an end when right Knowledge is achieved.

यत्कामस्तत्क्रतुर्भूत्वा कृतं त्वज्ञः प्रपद्यते ।
यदा स्वात्मदृशः कामाः प्रमुच्यन्तेऽमृतस्तदा ॥ ४८ ॥

48. A man of Ignorance reaps[4] the results of those actions done according to particular desires followed by

[1] See verse 5, chapter 15.
[2] Chh. U., 8. 8. 4, 5. [3] Opponents of gods.
[4] See verse 19 of this chapter.

particular determinations. But when the desires [1] of a man of Self-knowledge vanish he becomes immortal.[2]

आत्मरूपविधेः कार्यं क्रियादिभ्यो निवर्तनम् ।
न साध्यं साधनं वाऽऽत्मा नित्यतृप्तः स्मृतेर्मतः ॥ ४९ ॥

49. The outcome of the ascertainment of the real nature of the Self is cessation from actions etc. and from having an end or a means. (For) It is, according to the *Smriti*,[3] eternally contended.

उत्पाद्याप्यविकार्याणि संस्कार्यं च क्रियाफलम् ।
नातोऽन्यत्कर्मणा कार्यं त्यजेत्तस्मात्ससाधनम् ॥ ५० ॥

50. The results of actions are the production, acquisition, transformation and purification of something. They produce no other results. All actions with their accessories [4] should, therefore, be given [5] up.

तापान्तत्वादनित्यत्वादात्मार्थत्वाच्च या बहिः ।
संहृत्यात्मनि तां प्रीतिं सत्यार्थी गुरुमाश्रयेत् ॥ ५१ ॥
शान्तं प्राज्ञं तथा मुक्तं निष्क्रियं ब्रह्मणि स्थितम् ।
श्रुतेराचार्यवान्वेद तद्विद्धीति स्मृतेस्तथा ॥ ५२ ॥

51, 52. One desirous of attaining Truth should withdraw into the Self the love that he has for external

[1] For these are in the mind and such a man gives up his identification with it on the strength of Self-knowledge.

[2] *Brahman.*

[3] Bh. Gîtâ, 4. 20.

[4] Wife, children, wealth, sacred tuft of hair and holy thread.

[5] By one who aspires after liberation which by its nature cannot be the result of any action.

persons or things. For this love, secondary [1] to that for the Self, is evanescent and entails pain. He then should take refuge in a Teacher who is tranquil, free, bereft of actions and established in *Brahman* as the *Sruti* [2] and *Smriti* [3] say "One having a Teacher knows" and "Know that."

स गुरुस्तारयेद्युक्तं शिष्यं शिष्यगुणान्वितम् ।
ब्रह्मविद्याप्लवेनाशु स्वान्तध्वान्तमहोदधिम् ॥ ५३ ॥

53. That teacher should immediately take the disciple in the boat of the Knowledge of *Brahman* across the great ocean of the darkness [4] which is within him—the disciple who is of a one-pointed mind and endowed with the qualities [5] of a (true) disciple.

दृष्टिः स्पृष्टिः श्रुतिर्घ्रातिर्मतिर्विज्ञातिरेव च ।
शक्तयोऽन्याश्च भिद्यन्ते चिद्रूपत्वेऽप्युपाधिभिः ॥ ५४ ॥

54. The powers of seeing, touching, hearing, smelling, thinking, knowing and so on, though of the nature of Pure Consciousness,[6] differ on account of adjuncts.[7]

अपायोद्भूतिहीनाभिर्नित्यं दीप्यन्रवियथा ।
सर्वज्ञः सर्वदृक् शुद्धः सर्वं जानाति सर्वदा ॥ ५५ ॥

55. Just as the sun illumines the world with its rays which are free from growth and decay, so, the Self

[1] See verses 4 and 5 of this chapter. [2] Chh. U., 6. 14. 2.
[3] Bh. Gîtâ, 4. 34.
[4] Ignorance. [5] See verse 72, chapter 16.
[6] See verses 14, 15 and 16 of this chapter.
[7] The eye etc., the sense organs.

always knows[1] all things in general and all particular things and is pure.

अन्यदृष्टिः शरीरस्थस्तावन्मात्रो ह्यविद्यया ।
जलेन्द्वाद्युपमाभिस्तु तद्धर्मा च विभाव्यते ॥ ५६ ॥

56. Appearing to be in the body[2] owing to Ignorance and, therefore, appearing to be of the same size[2] as the body the Self is regarded as different from things other than the body (and possessed of its qualities) like the moon etc. reflected in water and appearing to be possessed of its qualities.

दृष्ट्वा बाह्यं निमील्याथ स्मृत्वा तत्प्रविहाय च ।
अथोन्मील्यात्मनो दृष्टिं ब्रह्म प्राप्नोत्यनध्वगः ॥ ५७ ॥

57. One merges the gross external objects experienced in the waking state in the subtle objects experienced in dream and these again in Ignorance. One then comes to have the vision of the Consciousness of the Self, attains *Brahman*[4] and has not to follow any path (northern[5] or southern.[6])

प्राणाद्येवं त्रिकं हित्वा तीर्णोऽज्ञानमहोदधिम् ।
स्वात्मस्थो निर्गुणः शुद्धो बुद्धो मुक्तः स्वतो हि सः ॥ ५८ ॥

[1] With Its consciousness which is Itself.
[2] Gross and subtle. [3] See verse 22, chapter 16.
[4] For a clearer exposition see verses 65 and 66 of this chapter, and also Mâ. U., 3—7.
[5] The path which leads one to the region of *Brahmâ* (Hiranyagarbha) at death. See Br. U., 6. 2. 15, and Bh. Gîtâ, 8. 24.
[6] The path leading to the region of the moon when one dies. See Br. U., 6. 2. 16, and Bh. Gîtâ, 8. 25.

58. Having thus renounced [1] the three states of the undifferentiated [2] etc. one gets across the great ocean of Ignorance, for one is by nature established in the Self without qualities, pure, awakened and free.

अजोऽहं चामरोऽमृत्युरजरोऽभय एव च ।
सर्वज्ञः सर्वदृक् शुद्ध इति बुद्धो न जायते ॥ ५९ ॥

59. One is not born again when one knows that one is unborn, deathless, devoid of old age, free from fear, pure and all-knowing (i.e. knowing all particular things and things in general).

पूर्वोक्तं यत्तमोबीजं तन्नास्तीति विनिश्चयः ।
तद्भावे कुतो जन्म ब्रह्मैकत्वं विजानतः ॥ ६० ॥

60. How can one be born again who has known the oneness of the Self and *Brahman* and is sure of the non-existence of the seed, called Ignorance, stated before [3] ?

क्षीरात्सर्पिर्यथोद्धृत्य क्षिप्तं तस्मिन्नपूर्ववत् ।
बुद्ध्यादेर्ज्ञस्तथाऽसत्यान्न देही पूर्ववद्भवेत् ॥ ६१ ॥

61. When the Witness is discriminated from the intellect etc. which are unreal It does not identify Itself again with the (gross or the subtle) body as before, just as butter raised from milk and thrown into it does not get mixed with it again.

[1] I.e., one's identity with the three states. [2] Deep sleep.
[3] Verse 26 above.

सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं च रसादेः पञ्चकात्परम् ।
स्यामदृश्यादिशास्त्रोक्तमहं ब्रह्मेति निर्भयः ॥ ६२ ॥

62. One becomes free from fear when one knows that one is *Brahman* which is Existence, Knowledge and Infinite beyond the five sheaths consisting of food etc.[1] and which is described in the *Sruti*[2] as not perceivable and so on.

यस्माद्भीताः प्रवर्तन्ते वाङ्मनःपावकादयः ।
तदात्मानन्दतत्त्वज्ञो न बिभेति कुतश्चन ॥ ६३ ॥

63. That knower of the Truth of the Bliss of the Self has no cause of fear whatsoever. For afraid[3] of Him the organ of speech, the mind, fire and so on act regularly.

नामादिभ्यः परे भूम्नि स्वाराज्ये चेत्स्थितोऽद्वये ।
प्रणमेत्कं तदात्मज्ञो न कार्यं कर्मणा तदा ॥ ६४ ॥

64. Whom should the knower of the Self salute if he is established in his own Glory which is infinite, non-dual and beyond name[4] etc.? Actions then have no utility (for him).

विराड्वैश्वानरो बाह्यः स्मरन्नन्तः प्रजापतिः ।
प्रविलीने तु सर्वस्मिन्प्राज्ञोऽव्याकृतमुच्यते ॥ ६५ ॥
वाचारम्भणमात्रत्वात्सुषुप्तादित्रिकं त्वसत् ।
सत्यो ज्ञश्चाहमित्येवं सत्यसन्धो विमुच्यते ॥ ६६ ॥

[1] The vital force, the mind, the intellect and bliss. See Tai. U., 2. 1. 5. [2] Tai. U., 2. 7. [3] Tai. U., 2. 8. 1.
[4] Chh. U., chapter 7, parts 1—15.

65, 66. The externally conscious individual which is one with the aggregate of the gross bodies, and the individual which is conscious internally only and one with the aggregate of the subtle bodies, are both merged[1] in the individual experiencing deep sleep which is one with the undifferentiated.

As the three states viz., deep sleep etc. have words only for their support they are unreal. The truthful[2] man, therefore, who knows that he is Existence-*Brahman* gets liberated.

भारूपत्वाद्यथा भानोर्नाहोरात्रे, तथैव च ।
ज्ञानाज्ञाने न मे स्यातां चिद्रूपत्वाविशेषतः ॥ ६७ ॥

67. I have no knowledge or ignorance in Me as I am of the nature of homogeneous Consciousness only, just as there is no day or night in the sun which is of the nature of light only.

शास्त्रस्यानतिशङ्क्यत्वाद्ब्रह्मैव स्यामहं सदा ।
ब्रह्मणो मे न हेयं स्याद् ग्राह्यं वेति च संस्मरेत् ॥ ६८ ॥

68. As the truth of the scriptures may never be doubted one should always remember that one is *Brahman* and, therefore, has nothing to accept or reject.

अहमेव च भूतेषु सर्वेष्वेको नभो यथा ।
मयि सर्वाणि भूतानि पश्यन्नेवं न जायते ॥ ६९ ॥

69. A man is never born again who knows that he is the One Existence in all beings like the ether and that all beings are in him.

[1] Mâ. U., 3—7 and verse 57 above. [2] Chh. U., 6. 16. 1—3.

न बाह्यं मध्यतो वान्तर्विद्यतेऽन्यत्स्वतः क्वचित् ।
अबाह्यान्तःश्रुते किंचित्तस्माच्छुद्धः स्वयंप्रभः ॥ ७० ॥

70. The Self is pure and self-effulgent having by nature no interior, exterior, middle or anything else anywhere according to the *Sruti*,[1] 'devoid of the interior and exterior.'

नेतिनेत्यादिशास्त्रेभ्यः प्रपञ्चोपशमोऽद्वयः ।
अविज्ञातादिशास्त्राच्च नैव ज्ञेयो ह्यतोऽन्यथा ॥ ७१ ॥

71. The Self is non-dual (and left over) by the negation of the universe according to the *Sruti*,[2] 'Not this, not this.' It should be known as described in the *Sruti*, 'Unknown[3] knower' and never otherwise.

सर्वस्यात्माहमेवेति ब्रह्म चेद्विदितं परम् ।
स आत्मा सर्वभूतानामात्मा ह्येषामिति श्रुतेः ॥ ७२ ॥

72. If one knows that one is the supreme *Brahman*, the Self of all, one should be regarded as the Self of all beings according to the *Sruti*,[4] 'their Self.'

जीवश्चेत्परमात्मानं स्वात्मानं देवमञ्जसा ।
देवोपास्यः स देवानां पशुत्वाच्च निवर्तते ॥ ७३ ॥

73. An individual becomes adorable by gods and free from being under their control (unlike beasts[4] under men) if he clearly knows the supreme Self, the shining One to be himself.

[1] Br. U., 2. 5. 19.
[2] Br. U., 2. 3. 6.
[3] Br. U., 3. 8. 11.
[4] Br. U., 1. 4. 10.

अहमेव सदात्मज्ञः शून्यस्त्वन्यैर्यथाम्बरम् ।
इत्येवं सत्यसंधत्वादसद्भाता न बध्यते ॥ ७४ ॥

74. The Truthful man [1] who has renounced everything unreal [2] does not get bound again when he knows that he is always Consciousness, the eternally existing Self devoid of everything like the ether.

कृपणास्तेऽन्यथैवातो विदुर्ब्रह्म परं हि ये ।
स्वराड्योऽनन्यदृक् स्वस्थस्तस्य देवा असन्वशे ॥ ७५ ॥

75. Those are to be pitied who know the supreme *Brahman* to be otherwise.[3] Those, on the other hand, who know It to be not different from themselves are established in the Self and are their own masters.[4] They have all the gods under their control.

हित्वा जात्यादिसंबन्धान्वाचोऽन्याः सह कर्मभिः ।
ओमित्येवं सदात्मानं सर्वं शुद्धं प्रपद्यथ ॥ ७६ ॥
सेतुं सर्वव्यवस्थानामहोरात्रादिवर्जितम् ।
तिर्यगूर्ध्वमधः सर्वं सकृज्ज्योतिरनामयम् ॥ ७७ ॥

76, 77. Give up all connection with caste etc., all actions and all talk regarding the non-Self. Always meditate on the pure Self, the all-comprehensive Principle as *Aum* [5]—The Self which like a causeway [6]

[1] Chh. U., 6. 16. 1—3. [2] Chh. U., 6. 1. 4.
[3] I.e., to be other than the Self.
[4] Not subordinate to anyone else. See Chh. U., 7. 25. 2.
[5] The sound 'Aum' is the name and symbol of *Brahman*. See Kath. U., 1. 2. 16, 17.
[6] A causeway protects cornfields etc. by preventing water from entering into them.

protects everything established (such as, castes, orders of life etc.) and which, untouched by day and night, is all directions, horizontal, upward and downward and which, free from unhappiness, is of the nature of eternal Consciousness.

धर्माधर्मविनिर्मुक्तं भूतभव्यात्कृताकृतात् ।
स्वमात्मानं परं विद्याद्विमुक्तं सर्वबन्धनैः ॥ ७८ ॥

78. One should know oneself to be the Supreme *Brahman* free from all bondage—merit, demerit, past, future, cause and effect.

अकुर्वन्सर्वकृच्छुद्धस्तिष्ठन्नत्येति धावतः ।
मायया सर्वशक्तित्वादजः सन्बहुधा मतः ॥ ७९ ॥

79. The Self is the doer of everything though It is a non-doer. It is pure. It runs ahead of those that run though It does not move at all. It appears to be many though unborn. For It possesses all powers by *Mâyâ*.

राजवत्साक्षिमात्रत्वात्सांनिध्याद्भ्रामको यथा ।
भ्रामयञ्जगदात्माहं निष्क्रियोऽकारकोऽद्वयः ॥ ८० ॥

80. Without action, a non-agent and one without a second I, the universal Self, make the world go round like a king who is only a witness or like the loadstone which moves iron by its proximity only.

निर्गुणं निष्क्रियं नित्यं निर्द्वन्द्वं यन्निरामयम् ।
शुद्धं बुद्धं तथा मुक्तं तद्ब्रह्मास्मीति धारयेत् ॥ ८१ ॥

81. One should have the conception that one is *Brahman* which is without qualities, without actions, Eternal, free from duality, free from unhappiness, pure, awakened and free.

बन्धं मोक्षं च सर्वं यत इदमुभयं हेयमेकं द्वयं च ।
ज्ञेयं ज्ञेयाभ्यतीतं परममधिगतं तत्त्वमेकं विशुद्धम् ।
विज्ञायैतद्यथावच्छ्रुतिमुनिगदितं शोकमोहावतीतः ।
सर्वज्ञः सर्वकृत्स्याद्भवभयरहितो ब्राह्मणोऽवाप्तकृत्यः ॥ ८२ ॥

82. Having gained a perfect knowledge of bondage and liberation with their causes (viz., Ignorance and Knowledge respectively), having acquired a complete understanding of the cause[1] and effect[2] which are objects of knowledge and are, (therefore,) to be negated, and having properly known the one supreme and pure Truth (to be the Self) which is beyond all objects of knowledge, known in the *Vedântas* and taught by *Srutis* and knowers of *Brahman* one stands freed from the fear of being born again, becomes all-knowing, has everything accomplished, goes beyond grief and delusion and, (therefore,) has the acme of his life fulfilled.

न स्वयं स्वस्य नान्यश्च नान्यस्यात्मा च हेयगः ।
उपादेयो न चाप्येवमिति सम्यङ्मतिः स्मृता ॥ ८३ ॥

83. The Self cannot be accepted or rejected by Itself or others, nor does It accept or reject anyone else. This is right Knowledge.

[1] एकं in the text. [2] द्वयं in the text.

आत्मप्रत्यायिका ह्येषा सर्ववेदान्तगोचरा ।
ज्ञात्वैतां हि विमुच्यन्ते सर्वसंसारबन्धनैः ॥ ८४ ॥

84. For this Knowledge, the subject of all the *Vedântas* produces the conviction that the Self is *Brahman.* One becomes perfectly free from the bondage of this transmigratory existence when one achieves it.

रहस्यं सर्ववेदानां देवानां चापि यत्परम् ।
पवित्रं परमं ह्येतत्तदेतत्संप्रकाशितम् ॥ ८५ ॥

85. This Knowledge, the supreme purifier, the greatest secret [1] of all the *Vedas* and gods [2] is revealed here (in this chapter).

नैतद्देयमशान्ताय रहस्यं ज्ञानमुत्तमम् ।
विरक्ताय प्रदातव्यं शिष्यायानुगताय च ॥ ८६ ॥

86. This supreme and secret Knowledge should not be imparted to one who has not controlled oneself, but should be given to a disciple who is obedient and dispassionate.

ददतश्चात्मनो ज्ञानं निष्क्रयोऽन्यो न विद्यते ।
ज्ञानमिच्छंस्तरेत्तस्माद्युक्तः शिष्यगुणैः सदा ॥ ८७ ॥

87. As there is no other equivalent (which a disciple may offer to the teacher) for imparting (to him)

[1] For this Knowledge does not come without being taught by a Teacher. [2] Not easily attainable even by gods. See Kath. U., I. 1. 21.

Selfknowledge one should always possess the qualities [1] of a disciple, achieve Knowledge and thus get across the ocean of transmigratory existence.

ज्ञानं ज्ञेयं तथा ज्ञाता यस्मादन्यो न विद्यते ।
सर्वज्ञः सर्वशक्तिर्यस्तस्मै ज्ञानात्मने नमः ॥ ८८ ॥

88. I bow down to that All-knowing and All-powerful One who is of the nature of Consciousness and besides whom there is nothing else viz., a knower, knowledge or an object of knowledge.

विद्यया तारिताः स्मो यैर्जन्ममृत्युमहोदधिम् ।
सर्वज्ञेभ्यो नमस्तेभ्यो गुरुभ्योऽज्ञानसंकुलम् ॥ ८९ ॥

89. I bow down to my most adorable Teacher who is all-knowing and has, by imparting Knowledge to me, saved me from the great ocean of births and deaths filled with Ignorance.

[1] See verse 72, chapter 16.

तत्त्वमसिप्रकरणम् ॥ १८ ॥

CHAPTER XVIII

'THOU ART THAT'

येनात्मना विलीयन्ते उद्भवन्ति च वृत्तयः ।
नित्यावगतये तस्मै नमो धीप्रत्ययात्मने ॥ १ ॥

1. I bow down to that Eternal consciousness, the Self of the modifications of the intellect, in which[1] they merge[2] and from which they spring.[3]

प्रमथ्य वज्रोपमयुक्तिसंभृतैः श्रुतेररातीन्शतशो वचोसिभिः ।
ररक्ष वेदार्थनिधिं विशालधीर्नमो यतीन्द्राय गुरोर्गरीयसे ॥ २ ॥

2. I bow down to the great mendicant, the Teacher of my Teacher who, of great intellect, routed hundreds of enemies of the *Sruti* by means of words comparable to swords and made impenetrable through thunder-like reasoning, and who protected the treasure of the real import of the *Vedas*.

नित्यमुक्तः सदेवास्मीत्येवं चेन्न भवेन्मतिः ।
किमर्थं श्रावयत्येव मातृवच्छ्रुतिरादरात् ॥ ३ ॥

[1] Just as circles of fire (e.g., in a revolving torch) merge in and spring from fire. [2] E.g., during deep sleep. [3] E.g., during waking and dream when they spring from the Self.

3. If the conviction, 'I am nothing but Existence and am ever free' were impossible to be attained, why should the *Sruti* teach us that so affectionately like a mother ?

सिद्धादेवाहमित्यस्माद्युष्मद्धर्मो निषिध्यते ।
रज्ज्वामिवाहिधीर्युक्त्या तत्त्वमित्यादिशासनैः ॥ ४ ॥

4. Just as the idea of a snake is negated from a rope (in a rope-snake), so, everything of the nature of the non-Self is negated from the eternally existing Self implied by the word 'I', on the evidence of the *Srutis*, 'Thou art That' etc. and by reasoning.

शास्त्रप्रामाण्यतो ज्ञेया धर्मादेरस्तिता यथा ।
विषापोह्यो यथा ध्यानाद् ह्नुतिः स्यात्पाप्मनस्तथा ॥ ५ ॥

5. *Brahman* should be regarded as the Self on the evidence of the scriptures, just as religious duties are known from the same source. Ignorance vanishes (immediately on the attainment of right Knowledge) like the effect of poison coming to an end when *mantras*[1] are remembered.

सद्ब्रह्माहं करोमीति प्रत्ययावात्मसाक्षिकौ ।
तयोरज्ञानजस्यैव त्यागो युक्ततरो मतः ॥ ६ ॥
सदस्मीति प्रमाणोत्था धीरन्या तन्निभोद्भवा ।
प्रत्यक्षादिनिभा वापि बाध्यते दिग्भ्रमादिवत् ॥ ७ ॥

[1] Sacred formulae addressed to individual deities like *Garuda* and others.

6, 7. It is reasonable that of the two ideas, 'I am Existence-Brahman' and 'I am an agent' both of which have the Self for their witness, the one owing its origin to Ignorance should be given up. Springing from evidences which are only apparently so viz., sense-perceptions etc., it gets negated like a mistaken notion of a direction by the other one which has its source in the right evidence of the *Vedas*.[1]

कुरु भोक्तेति यच्छास्त्रं लोकबुद्ध्यनुवादि तत् ।
सदस्मीति श्रुतेर्जाता बाध्यतेऽन्यैतयैव धीः ॥ ८ ॥

8. When they say 'Do this' and 'You are experiencers' the scriptures restate popular conceptions. The Knowledge, 'I am Existence' arises from the *Sruti*. The other[2] (arising from injunctive scriptures) is negated by it.

सदेव त्वमसीत्युक्ते नात्मनो मुक्तता स्थिरा ।
प्रवर्तते प्रसंचक्षामतो युक्त्याऽनुचिन्तयेत् ॥ ९ ॥

9. (Objection).[3] Absolute liberation does not arise when one is told, 'Thou art That.' One should, therefore, have recourse to the reiteration (of the idea, 'I am Brahman') and support it with reasoning.

सकृदुक्तं न गृह्णाति वाक्यार्थज्ञोपि यो भवेत् ।
अपेक्षतेऽत एवान्यदवोचाम द्वयं हि तत् ॥ १० ॥

[1] For they are the words of the Lord. See Br. Su., 1. 1. 3.
[2] I.e., the idea of agency and of experiencing.
[3] Objections—verses 9-18.

10. Even acquainted with the (literal) meaning of the sentence [1] one, once told, cannot know its true import but requires other things which, as we have said, are two.[2]

नियोगोऽप्रतिपन्नत्वात्कर्मणां स यथा भवेत् ।
अविरुद्धो भवेत्तावद्यावत्संवेद्यताऽदृढा ॥ ११ ॥

11. Just as an injunction regarding *Vedic* actions is necessary,[3] so, it is not incompatible (in the case of one) so long as one has not directly known the Self and Self-Knowledge has not been firmly grasped by one.

चेष्टितं च तथा मिथ्या स्वच्छन्दः प्रतिपद्यते ।
प्रसंख्यानमतः कार्यं यावदात्मानुभूतये ॥ १२ ॥

12. All one's efforts (viz., self-control etc.) become useless if one can know *Brahman* without being enjoined. One should, therefore, go on with the repetition so long as the Self is not known.

सद्‌स्मीति च विज्ञानमक्षजो बाधते ध्रुवम् ।
शब्दोत्थं दृढसंस्कारो दोषैश्चाकृष्यते बहिः ॥ १३ ॥

13. Firm impressions originating from sense-perception do surely negate the Knowledge, 'I am *Brahman*' arising from the *Sruti*.[5] Moreover an aspirant is attracted

[1] I.e., 'Thou art That'.
[2] (1) Mental repetition of the sentence and (2) looking for reasoning in support of it.
[3] Even when actions are known from *Vedic* statements an injunction regarding them is necessary so that one may get the result arising from the observance of the injunction.
[4] From the *Vedic* statement, 'Thou art that'.
[5] Br. U., 1. 4. 10.

towards external objects through impurities (such as, attachment and so on).

श्रुतानुमानजन्मानौ सामान्यविषयौ यतः ।
प्रत्यक्षावक्षजोऽवश्यं विशेषार्थौ निवारयेत् ॥ १४ ॥

14. Perceptional Knowledge [1] which has for its objects particular properties of things does surely contradict that [2] which arises from hearsay and inference and which is related only to generic properties of things.

वाक्यार्थप्रत्ययी कश्चिन्निर्दुःखो नोपलभ्यते ।
यदि वा दृश्यते कश्चिद्वाक्यार्थश्रुतिमात्रतः ॥ १५ ॥
निर्दुःखोऽतीतदेहेषु कृतभावोऽनुमीयते ।
चर्या नोऽशास्त्रसंवेद्या स्यादनिष्टं तथासति ॥ १६ ॥

15, 16. No one is seen freed from the distress (of this transmigratory existence) simply by understanding the meaning of the sentence. If, however, a rare man [3] is seen to be freed from such distress on the mere hearing of it he must be inferred to have practised repetition in previous lives. Moreover our [4] conduct will have to be regarded as non-scriptural (if you do not admit the existence of an injunction) in this case.[5] But that is not desirable.

[1] E.g., the knowledge that arises by actually seeing fire.

[2] E.g., the knowledge that arises on hearing the word 'fire' or through inference on seeing smoke.

[3] E.g., Vâmadeva, who, while in his mother's womb, had Self-knowledge. See Ai. U., 2. 5.

[4] The conduct of mendicants.

[5] In the case of one who has become acquainted with the sentence, but not with the Self.

सदसीति फलं चोक्त्वा विधेयं साधनं यतः ।
न तदन्यत्प्रसंख्यानात्प्रसिद्धार्थमिहेष्यते ॥ १७ ॥

17. (Just as everywhere in the *Vedas*) the means to an end is enjoined after stating the result[1] to be achieved, so, here[2] (the result, 'Thou art That' is stated and) the means can be nothing but this repetition which only[3] is regarded as being capable of revealing an eternally existing thing.[4]

तस्मादनुभवायैव प्रसंचक्षीत यत्नतः ।
त्यजन्साधनतत्साध्यविरुद्धं शमनादिमान् ॥ १८ ॥

18. Therefore, practising self-control etc. and renouncing everything[5] incompatible with this end[6] and the means[7] to it one should carefully practise the said reiteration in order directly to know the Self.

नैतदेवं रहस्यानां नेतिनेत्यवसानतः ।
क्रियासाध्यं पुरा श्राव्यं न मोक्षो नित्यसिद्धतः ॥ १९ ॥

19. (Reply). This is not so; for the *Upanishats* end[8] with 'Not this, not this' (and deal with nothing[9] else). Results to be achieved by means of actions are heard of in the previous[10] part of the *Vedas* but

[1] For example, 'desirous of attaining heaven a man should perform sacrifices,' Similarly, desirous of attaining *Brahman* one should practise the said repetition.
[2] In the *Vedântas*.
[3] And not sacrifices etc.
[4] *Brahman*.
[5] All actions.
[6] The direct Knowledge of *Brahman*.
[7] The said repetition.
[8] I.e., with *Brahman* having duality negated from It.
[9] I.e., they do not enjoin actions.
[10] In the work portion.

not liberation which has an eternal existence (and is not achievable by means of any action).

पुत्रदुःखं यथाध्यस्तं पित्राऽदुःखे स्व आत्मनि ।
अहंकर्ता तथाध्यस्तो नित्यादुःखे स्व आत्मनि ॥ २० ॥

20. Just as the distress experienced by one's son is superimposed by the father on himself who has no distress at all, so, the ego is superimposed on the Self which is eternally free from any pain whatsoever.

सोऽध्यासो नेतिनेतीति प्राप्तवत्प्रतिषिध्यते ।
भूयोऽध्यासविधिः कश्चित्कुतश्चिन्नोपपद्यते ॥ २१ ॥

21. This superimposition (of the ego on the Self) is negated on the evidence of the *Sruti* ' Not this, not this ', as if[1] it were a reality. And hence no injunctions[2] which are all due to superimposition can by any means be reasonable (after such a negation has taken place).

आत्मनीह तथाध्यासः प्रतिषेधस्तथैव च ।
मलाध्यासनिषेधौ खे क्रियेते च यथाऽबुधैः ॥ २२ ॥

22. Just as colour is superimposed on and negated from the sky by ignorant people, so, there are the superimposition (of the ego) on the Self and its negation from It.

प्राप्तश्चेत्प्रतिषिध्येत मोक्षोऽनित्यो भवेद्ध्रुवम् ।
अतोऽप्राप्तनिषेधोऽयं दिव्यग्निचयनादिवत् ॥ २३ ॥

[1] For it is only things superimposed that are negated.
[2] Such as, the repetition of the sentence.

23. This negation is not one of a reality, but of a false superimposition only like the prohibition of the placing of fire[1] on the highest region of the sky; for liberation would have surely been transitory if things really existing were negated.

संभाव्यो गोचरे शब्दः प्रत्ययो वा न चान्यथा ।
न संभाव्यौ तदात्मत्वादहंकर्तुस्तथैव च ॥ २४ ॥

24. It is only to objects of knowledge and not to non-objects that a word[2] or an idea[2] can be applied. *Brahman* which is the Self of them and also of the ego is not within the scope of a word or an idea.

अहंकर्त्रात्मनि न्यस्तं चैतन्ये कर्तृतादि यत् ।
नेति नेतीति तत्सर्वं साहंकर्त्रा निषिध्यते ॥ २५ ॥

25. Everything such as agency etc. superimposed[3] by the ego on (the Self), Pure Consciousness is negated together with the ego on the evidence of the *Sruti*, 'Not this, not this.'

उपलब्धिः स्वयंज्योतिर्दृशिः प्रत्यक्सदक्रियः ।
साक्षात्सर्वान्तरः साक्षी चेता नित्योऽगुणोऽद्वयः ॥ २६ ॥

26. (The Self is then known to be) Intelligence, Self-effulgent, a Seer, the Innermost, Existence, free from actions, directly cognised, the Self of all, the

[1] There is the scriptural statement that fire should be placed neither in the highest nor in the middle region of the sky. The placing of fire in those two regions is an impossibility; still it is forbidden like the real placing of fire on the earth.
[2] I.e., all the evidences.
[3] Through the indiscrimination between the intellect and the Self.

Witness, One imparting consciousness to others, Eternal, devoid of qualities and without a second.

संनिधौ सर्वदा तस्य स्यात्तदाभोऽभिमानकृत् ।
आत्मात्मीयं द्वयं चातः स्यादहंममगोचरः ॥ २७ ॥

27. On account of the constant proximity of the conscious Self the ego also appears to be conscious.[1] Hence the two things viz., oneself[2] and things related to oneself denoted by the words, 'I' and 'mine' originate.

जातिकर्मादिमत्त्वाद्धि तस्मिञ्शब्दास्त्वहंकृति ।
न कश्चिद्वर्तते शब्दस्तदभावात्स्व आत्मनि ॥ २८ ॥

28. As the ego is possessed of species action, etc. words are applicable to it. But no word can be used with respect to the innermost Self owing to the absence[3] of these from it.

आभासो यत्र तत्रैव शब्दाः प्रत्यग्दृशि स्थिताः ।
लक्षयेयुर्न साक्षात्तमभिदध्युः कथंचन ॥ २९ ॥
नह्यजात्यादिमान्कश्चिदर्थः शब्दैर्निरूप्यते ॥ ३० ॥

29, 30. Words which denote the ego and the other things which reflect the innermost Self express the latter only indirectly but by no means describe It directly. For nothing that has no species etc. can be described by means of words.

[1] E.g., Proximate to a red flower a crystal appears to be red.
[2] The experiencer, the agent.
[3] See verse 24 above.

आत्माभासो यथाहंकृदात्मशब्दैस्तथोच्यते ।
उल्मुकादौ यथाग्न्यर्थाः परार्थत्वान्न चाञ्जसा ॥ ३१ ॥

31. Just as words denoting[1] the action of fire are applied only indirectly and nor directly to torches etc. (having fire in them) as they imply a thing[2] different from torches etc.; so, words[3] implying the Self are applied to the ego having the reflection of the Self (and appearing like It).

मुखादन्यो मुखाभासो यथादर्शानुकारतः ।
आभासान्मुखमप्येवमादर्शाननुवर्तनात् ॥ ३२ ॥
अहंकृत्यात्मनिर्भासो मुखाभासवदिष्यते ।
मुखवत्स्मृत आत्मान्योऽविविक्तौ तौ तथैव च ॥ ३३ ॥

32, 33. As it imitates the mirror the reflection of a face is different from the face. The face which does not depend on the mirror (for its existence) is also different[4] from its reflection. Similarly, the reflection of the Self in the ego is also *regarded* (as different from the pure Self) like that of the face which is different from the face. The pure Self is considered to be different (from Its reflection) like the face (which is different from its own). In fact, however, the Self and

[1] The word 'burn' for example, is used with reference to a torch when we say 'The torch burns a thing'. [2] Fire.

[3] E.g., the word, 'I' implying Existence, Knowledge, Bliss, etc.

[4] As a matter of fact it is the real face reflected in a mirror and acquiring, as it were, the quality of being in it and possessing its properties that is called the reflection. The reflection cannot be real, because it is not *always* in the mirror; nor can it be called absolutely unreal, because it is sometimes seen there. Therefore, the reflection is indescribable and the face is different from it.

Its reflection are free[1] from (real) distinction (between each other like the face and its reflection[2]).

संसारी च स इत्येक आभासो यस्त्वहंकृति ।
वस्तुच्छाया स्मृतेरन्यन्माधुर्यादि च कारणम् ॥ ३४ ॥

34. (Objection). Some say that the reflection in the ego (*as distinct from the Self*) is the individual soul.[3] (But if one asks how the reflection which is not a reality can experience anything at all the objector answers that) the reflection *is* a reality as the shadows of things are known to be realities according to the *Smriti*.[4] Not only so, there is another reason also (why a shadow should be regarded as a reality). For a man in a shadow feels refreshingly cool.

ज्ञैकदेशो विकारो वा तदाभासाश्रयः परे ।
अहंकर्तैव संसारी स्वतन्त्र इति केचन ॥ ३५ ॥

35. (Other objections). Some say that the individual soul is a part of Pure Consciousness. Others hold that it is a modification of the same. Still others are of opinion that the ego together with the reflection

[1] Though there is an apparent distinction there is not a real one between the Self and Its reflection nor between the Self and the intellect. For as a matter of fact neither the reflection nor the intellect has an existence independent of the Self. The conclusion is that Pure Consciousness, reflected in Ignorance and the ego etc., its modifications, is regarded as the individual experiencing transmigratory existence owing to a nondiscrimination between Itself and Its reflection. See *verse* 43 of this Chapter.

[2] Which has an existence dependent on that of the face.

[3] The experiencer of this transmigratory existence.

[4] 'One should not deliberately cross the shadows of one's teachers and other superiors.' [5] Therefore a shadow must be a real thing having the property of coolness.

of Pure Consciousness in it is the individual soul. Others again think that it is the independent ego, (neither a part nor a modification,) which is the experiencer of this mundane existence.

अहंकारादिसंतानः संसारी, नान्वयी कश्चित् ।
इत्येवं सौगता आहुस्तत्र न्यायो विचार्यताम् ॥ ३६ ॥

36. The[1] Buddhists say that the series of the momentary[2] consciousnesses, 'I' and so on, is the individual soul. There is no witness[3] (distinct from the series to see the beginning and the end of these momentary phenomena). Now examine which of these doctrines[4] is reasonable.

संसारिणां कथा त्वास्तां प्रकृतं त्वधुनोच्यते ।
मुखाभासो य आदर्शे धर्मो नान्यतरस्य सः ।
द्वयोरेकस्य चेद्धर्मो वियुक्तेऽन्यतरे भवेत् ॥ ३७ ॥

37. Let us now stop discussing the different doctrines about the transmigratory soul. Let us go on with the present subject.[5] The reflection of the face in the mirror is a property neither of the face nor of the mirror. For if it were the property of either of the two, it would continue even if the other were removed.

मुखेन व्यपदेशात्स मुखस्यैवेति चेन्मतम् ।
नादर्शानुविधानाच्च मुखे सत्यविभावतः ॥ ३८ ॥

[1] See verse 23, Chapter 16. [2] Produced and destroyed every moment. [3] See footnote 1, verse 14, Chapter 16. [4] Including that of the author. See footnote 1, p. 228.

[5] Viz., the reflection. Five alternatives are discussed. Verses 37, 38, 39 (first line), 39 (second line) to 42, and 43. The last one is the conclusion according to this book.

38. If it is argued that it[1] is a property of the face because it[1] is called after it, that cannot be so. For it imitates[2] the mirror and is not seen even when the face is there (but the mirror is removed).

द्वयोरेवेति चेत्तन्न द्वयोरेवाप्यदर्शनात् ।
अदृश्यस्य सतो दृष्टिः स्याद्राहोश्चन्द्रसूर्ययोः ॥ ३९ ॥

39. (First line). If you say that it is the property of both, we say 'No'; because it is not seen even when both are present (but improperly placed).

(Second line). (Objection). It may be said that Râhu, a real thing, though invisible, is (sometimes) seen[3] in the sun and moon; (so the reflection of the face, a reality, though invisible, is sometimes[4] seen in the mirror).

राहोः प्रागेव वस्तुत्वं सिद्धं शास्त्रप्रमाणतः ।
छायापक्षे त्ववस्तुत्वं तस्य स्यात्पूर्वयुक्तितः ॥ ४० ॥

40. (Reply). That Râhu is a real[5] thing is known from the scriptures[6] before one sees it in the sun or moon. But according to those who hold that it is the shadow of the earth it cannot be a real thing and the unreality of the reflection has been proved by arguments before.[7]

[1] That is, the reflection of the *face*.
[2] I.e., undergoes changes that the mirror is subject to.
[3] During eclipses. See footnote 4, verse 34, Ch. 17.
[4] When a mirror is properly placed.
[5] See footnote 4, verse 34, Ch. 17.
[6] But there is no such evidence with regard to the existence of the reflection.
[7] Verses 37-39 above.

छायाक्रान्तेर्निषेधोऽयं नतु वस्तुत्वसाधकः ।
नह्यर्थान्तरनिष्ठं सद्वाक्यमर्थान्तरं वदेत् ॥ ४१ ॥

41. This is a prohibition[1] regarding the crossing of the shadows (of one's teachers and other superiors); but it does not prove the reality of a shadow as a sentence expressing one meaning cannot express another at the same time.

माधुर्यादि च यत्कार्यमुष्णद्रव्याद्यसेवनात् ।
छायाया न त्वदृष्टत्वादपामेव च दर्शनात् ॥ ४२ ॥

42. That one feels cool while sitting in a shadow[2] is not the effect of the shadow on one. It is due to one's refraining from using warm things. Coolness is found to belong to water but not to a shadow.[3]

आत्माभासाश्रयाश्चैवं मुखाभासाश्रया यथा ।
गम्यन्ते शास्त्रयुक्तिभ्यामाभासासत्त्वमेव च ॥ ४३ ॥

43. The Self, Its reflection and the seat of the reflection, (*i.e.*, the intellect) are comparable to the face, its reflection and the mirror. The unreality of the reflection is known from the scriptures and reasoning.

न दृशेरविकारित्वादाभासस्याप्यवस्तुतः ।
नाचितित्त्वादहंकर्तुः कस्य संसारिता भवेत् ॥ ४४ ॥

44. (Objection). Who is the experiencer of transmigratory existence as it cannot belong to the Self

[1] See footnote 4, verse 34.　　[2] See verse 34 above.
[3] For, sitting in the shadow of a hot piece of stone, one does not feel cool at all.

which is changeless, neither to the reflection which is not real nor to the ego which is not a conscious entity ?

अविद्यामात्र एवातः संसारोऽस्त्वविवेकतः ।
कूटस्थेनात्मना नित्यमात्मवानात्मनीव सः ॥ ४५ ॥

45. (Reply). Let the transmigratory condition then be only a delusion due to the indiscrimination (between the Self and the non-Self). It always has an (apparent) existence due to the real existence of the changeless Self and, therefore, appears to be pertaining to It.

रज्जुसर्पो यथा रज्ज्वा सात्मकः प्राग्विवेकतः ।
अवस्तु सन्नपि ह्येव कूटस्थेनात्मना तथा ॥ ४६ ॥

46. Just as a rope-snake (a rope mistaken for a snake), though unreal, has an existence due to that of the rope before the discrimination between the rope and the snake takes place ; so, the transmigratory condition, though unreal, is possessed of an existence[1] due to that[2] of the changeless Self.

आत्माभासाश्रयश्चात्मा प्रत्ययैः स्वैर्विकारवान् ।
सुखी दुःखी च संसारी नित्य एवेति केचन ॥ ४७ ॥

47. Some say that the Self, to which the reflection belongs, though changeful on account of the modifications of the mind pertaining to Itself such as, 'I am happy', 'I am miserable' and, though an experiencer of the transmigratory condition, is eternal.

[1] Empirical or phenomenal existence. [2] Real existence.

आत्माभासापरिज्ञानाद्याथात्म्येन विमोहिताः ।
अहंकर्तारमात्मेति मन्यन्ते ते निरागमाः ॥ ४८ ॥

48. Having no knowledge of the *Vedas* and deluded on account of the lack of the real knowledge of the Self and Its reflection they consider the ego to be the Self.

संसारो वस्तुसंस्तेषां कर्तृभोक्तृत्वलक्षणः ।
आत्माभासाश्रयाज्ञानात्संसरन्त्यविवेकतः ॥ ४९ ॥

49. The transmigratory existence consisting of agency and the experiencing (of pain and pleasure) is, according to them, a reality. They, therefore, continue to be born again and again on account of the ignorance of the nature of the Self, its reflection and the Seat of the reflection, (the intellect) between which they cannot discriminate.

चैतन्याभासता बुद्धेरात्मनस्तत्स्वरूपता ।
स्याच्चेत्तं ज्ञानशब्दैश्च वेदः शास्तीति युज्यते ॥ ५० ॥

50. That the *Vedas* imply the Self by means of words such as, 'Knowledge' etc.[1] becomes reasonable if it is true[2] that the Self is of the nature of Pure Consciousness and the intellect has Its reflection in it.

प्रकृतिप्रत्ययार्थौ यौ भिन्नावेकाश्रयौ यथा ।
करोति गच्छतीत्यादौ दृष्टौ लोकप्रसिद्धितः ॥ ५१ ॥
नानयोर्द्व्यर्थाश्रयत्वं च लोके दृष्टं स्मृतौ तथा ।
जानात्यर्थेषु को हेतुर्द्व्यर्थाश्रयत्वे निगद्यताम् ॥ ५२ ॥

[1] Words such as, Existence, Bliss and so on.
[2] These words will then be applied directly to the intellect with the reflection of the Self in it and indirectly to the Self. See verse 29.

51, 52. (Objection).[1] It is well known among the people that the meaning[2] of the root and that[3] of the verbal suffix, though different from each other in each of the words such as, 'does', 'goes', etc., are seen to belong to the same subject.[4]

They are not seen to belong to two different subjects either according to ordinary people or grammarians. Now, please tell me the reason why the meanings of the root and the suffix should belong to two different subjects in the case of the words such as, 'knows' etc.

आत्माभासस्तु तिङ्वाच्यो धात्वर्थश्च धियः क्रिया ।
उभयं चाविवेकेन जानातीत्युच्यते मृषा ॥ ५३ ॥

53. (Reply). The meaning of the suffix is the reflection of the Self (in the intellect) and the root denotes an action i.e., a modification of the intellect. As the intellect and the reflection are not discriminated from the Self the word 'knows'[5] is predicated falsely about It.

न बुद्धेरवबोधोऽस्ति नात्मनो विद्यते क्रिया ।
अतो नान्यतरस्यापि जानातीति च युज्यते ॥ ५४ ॥

54. The intellect has no consciousness and the Self no action. The word 'knows' can, therefore, reasonably be applied to neither of them.

नाप्यतो भावशब्देन ज्ञप्तिरित्यपि युज्यते ।
न ह्यात्मा विक्रियामात्रो नित्य आत्मेति शासनात् ॥ ५५ ॥

[1] The discussion begun here ends in verse 69.
[2] The meaning of a root is an action. [3] The meaning of a verbal suffix is agency. [4] E.g., Devadatta.
[5] Meaning wrongly that the Self is the agent of the action of knowing.

55. The word 'knowledge', in the sense of the action of knowing, cannot, similarly, be applied to the Self. For the Self is not a change only (as is indicated by an action) inasmuch as it is taught (in the *Srutis*) that It is eternal.

न बुद्धेर्बुद्धिवाच्यत्वं करणं न ह्यकर्तृकम् ।
नापि ज्ञायत इत्येवं कर्मशब्दैर्निरूप्यते ॥ ५६ ॥

56. The word, 'knowledge', in the sense of the instrument of the action of knowing, is applied to the intellect and not to the Self as an instrument cannot exist without an agent.[1] Neither can the word, in the sense of that which is the object of the action of knowing, be applied to the Self.

न येषामेक एवात्मा निर्दुःखोऽविक्रियः सदा ।
तेषां स्याच्छब्दवाच्यत्वं ज्ञेयत्वं चात्मनः सदा ॥ ५७ ॥

57. The Self is never knowable and is not directly denoted by any word according to those who hold[2] that It is eternally changeless, free from pain and one only.

यदाहंकर्तुरात्मत्वं तदा शब्दार्थमुख्यता ।
नाशनायादिमत्त्वात्तु श्रुतौ तस्यात्मतेष्यते ॥ ५८ ॥

58. If the ego were the Self a word might be applied to it in its primary sense.[3] But it is not the Self according to the *Sruti* as it is possessed of hunger etc.

[1] If the Self becomes an instrument there will be no agent left.
[2] It is the doctrine of the author. [3] See verse 29 above.

हन्त तर्हि न मुख्यार्थो नापि गौणः कथंचन ।
जानातीत्यादिशब्दस्य गतिर्वाच्या तथापि तु ॥ ५९ ॥
शब्दानामयथार्थत्वे वेदस्याप्यप्रमाणता ।
सा च नेष्टा, ततो ग्राह्या गतिरस्य प्रसिद्धितः ॥ ६० ॥
प्रसिद्धिर्मूढलोकस्य यदि ग्राह्या निरात्मता ।
लोकायतिकसिद्धान्तः सा चानिष्टा प्रसज्यते ॥ ६१ ॥
अभियुक्तप्रसिद्धिश्चेत्पूर्ववद्दुर्विवेकता ।
गतिशून्यं न वेदोऽयं प्रमाणं संवदत्युत ॥ ६२ ॥

59—62. (Objection). Well, words that have no primary meanings can have no secondary ones also. Therefore, you are to explain the application of the words 'knows' etc.

The *Vedas* would lose their authority as an evidence if words were false.[1] But that is not desirable.[2] (Reply). Should one, therefore, have to accept the application of words according to popular usage ?

(Objection). If you accept the usage of ignorant people you will have to arrive at the conclusion of the *Chârvâkas* who hold that there is no Self (other than the body). But that is undesirable.

If, on the other hand, you accept the usage of the learned you will arrive at the same dilemma as before.[3] The *Vedas* which are an authority do not use meaningless words.

आदर्शे मुखसामान्यं मुखस्येष्टं हि मानवैः ।
मुखस्य प्रतिबिम्बो हि मुखाकारेण दृश्यते ॥ ६३ ॥

[1] Have no meanings.

[2] For the Vedas are the only evidence regarding the Self.

[3] See verse 54 above.

यत्र यस्यावभासस्तु तयोरेवाविवेकतः ।
जानातीति क्रियां सर्वो लोको वक्ति स्वभावतः ॥ ६४ ॥

63, 64. (Reply). As the reflection appears like the face people accept its oneness with its reflection in a mirror.

All people, therefore, naturally use the verbs 'knows' etc. owing to the indiscrimination between that[1] in which there is the reflection and that[2] which is reflected.

बुद्धेः कर्तृत्वमध्यस्य जानातीति ज्ञ उच्यते ।
तथा चैतन्यमध्यस्य ज्ञत्वं बुद्धेरिहोच्यते ॥ ६५ ॥

65. The Self is said to be knowing[3] things on account of the superimposition of the agency of the intellect on It. Similarly the intellect is called a knower owing to the superimposition of Consciousness on it.[4]

स्वरूपं चात्मनो ज्ञानं नित्यं ज्योतिःश्रुतेर्यतः ।
न बुद्ध्या क्रियते तस्मान्नात्मनान्येन वा सदा ॥ ६६ ॥

66. Being Eternal, Knowledge which is the nature of the Self described by the *Srutis*[5] as the Light (of Consciousness) is never created by the intellect, by Itself or by anything[6] else.

देहेऽहंप्रत्ययो यद्वज्जानातीति च लौकिकाः ।
वदन्ति, ज्ञानकर्तृत्वं तद्वद्बुद्धेस्तथात्मनः ॥ ६७ ॥

[1] The intellect.
[2] The Self.
[3] To be the agent of knowing.
[4] See verse 54.
[5] Mu. U., 2. 2. 9 and Br. U., 4. 3. 6.
[6] By the eye etc.

67. Just as people regard their bodies as themselves and say that they (bodies) know things, so, they speak of the intellect having the agency in producing knowledge, and of the Self (as being its seat).

बौद्धैस्तु प्रत्ययैरेवं क्रियमाणैश्च चिन्निभैः ।
मोहिताः क्रियते ज्ञानमित्याहुस्तार्किका जनाः ॥ ६८ ॥

68. Deluded thus by the modifications of the intellect which appear[1] to be conscious and are created the argumentative philosophers say that knowledge is produced.

तस्माज्ज्ञाभासबुद्धीनामविवेकात्प्रवर्तिताः ।
जानातीत्यादि शब्दश्च प्रत्ययो या च तत्स्मृतिः ॥ ६९ ॥

69. Therefore the words 'knows' etc., the corresponding modifications of the mind and their memory are possible on account of the indiscrimination regarding the Self, the intellect and the reflection of the Self in it.

आदर्शानुविधायित्वं छायाया अस्यते मुखम् ।
बुद्धिधर्मानुकारित्वं ज्ञाभासस्य तथेष्यते ॥ ७० ॥

70. Just as the properties[2] of a mirror assumed by the reflection of the face in it are attributed to the face, so, the properties[3] of the intellect assumed by the reflection of the Self are superimposed on the Self.

[1] Owing to the mutual superimposition of the Self and the intellect.

[2] Dark spots etc.

[3] Agency etc.

बुद्धेस्तु प्रत्ययास्तस्मादात्माभासेन दीपिताः ।
ग्राहिका इव भासन्ते दहन्तीवोल्मुकादयः ॥ ७१ ॥

71. Therefore, just as torches and other things appear to be possessed of the power of burning (on account of there being fire in them), so, the modifications of the intellect, illumined by the reflection of the Self, appear to be endowed with the power of perception.

स्वयमेवावभास्यन्ते ग्राहकाः स्वयमेव च ।
इत्येवं ग्राहकास्तित्वं प्रतिषिद्धयन्ति सौगताः ॥ ७२ ॥

72. The Buddhist philosophers deny the existence of a Witness by saying that the modifications of the intellect are themselves perceivers and are also perceived (by themselves).

यद्येवं नान्यदृश्यास्ते किं तद्वारणमुच्यताम् ।
भावाभावौ हि तेषां यौ नान्यग्राह्यौ सता यदि ॥ ७३ ॥
अन्वयी ग्राहकस्तेषामित्येतदपि तत्समम् ।
अचितित्वस्य तुल्यत्वादन्यस्मिन्ग्राहके सति ॥ ७४ ॥

73, 74. Say[1] how to refute (the Buddhists who hold) that the modifications of the intellect are not illumined by a Witness different from them. (In refuting the Buddhists it may be said[2] that) though a persistent[3] Knower, different from the modifications, revealing their

[1] Addressed to the *Vedântins* who do not accept a reflection of the Self.
[2] By the said *Vedântins*.
[3] Known to be so on the evidence of recognition : the knower is the same in respect of all the modifications.

presence and absence must be accepted, it is not necessary to assume a reflection of the Self).

(Reply).[1] This persistent Knower also is no better than the modifications themselves as the said Knower, different from the modifications, will be equally non-Conscious.[2]

अध्यक्षस्य समीपे तु सिद्धिः स्यादिति चेन्मतम् ।
नाध्यक्षेऽनुपकारित्वादन्यत्रापि प्रसङ्गतः ॥ ७५ ॥

75. If you[3] are of opinion that the presence and absence of the modifications will be known owing to the proximity of the permanent Knower we say "No." For the (changeless) Knower will be of no utility. (Even admitting that It will reveal them by Its proximity only) everything[4] will have mental modifications.

अर्थी दुःखी च यः श्रोता स त्वध्यक्षोऽथवेतरः ।
अध्यक्षस्य च दुःखित्वमर्थित्वं च न ते मतम् ॥ ७६ ॥
कर्ताध्यक्षः सदस्मीति नैव सद्ग्रहमर्हति ।
सदेवासीति मिथ्योक्तिः श्रुतेरपि न युज्यते ॥ ७७ ॥
अविविच्योभयं वक्ति श्रुतिश्चेत्स्याद्ग्रहस्तथा ।
अस्मदस्तु विविच्यैव त्वमेवेति वदेद्यदि ।
प्रत्ययान्वयिनिष्ठत्वमुक्तदोषः प्रसज्यते ॥ ७८ ॥

[1] To the *Vedântins* who do not accept the reflection of the Self.
[2] For being a knower (an agent of knowing) it will fall into the category of the non-Self and so will be non-conscious.
[3] Those *Vedântins* who do not accept the reflection of the Self.
[4] Including non-conscious objects, inasmuch as the knower is all-pervading.

76—77. Is the hearer (i.e. the aspirant) who is suffering from the misery due to transmigratory existence and seeking liberation the Witness Itself or other than It? That the Witness is subject to misery and desirous of liberation is not your view.[1]

If, on the other hand, he be (other than the Witness) he then an agent, cannot accept the idea, 'I am *Brahman*, the Witness.' And, (in that case) the teaching of the *Sruti*, 'Thou art That' would be false, which is not reasonable.

78. (First line). But this teaching may be accepted if the *Sruti* teaches it without discriminating the two, (the Self and the ego).

78. (Last two lines). But if the *Sruti* discriminates[2] the ego from the innermost Self and then says to the ego 'Thou art That' the defects spoken of (in the previous verse) will creep in.

त्वमित्यध्यक्षनिष्ठश्चेदहमध्यक्षयोः कथम् ।
संबन्धो वाच्य एवात्र येन त्वमिति लक्षयेत् ॥ ७९ ॥

79. If you[3] say that the word 'thou' means finally the witness you must explain how there can be a relation[4] between It and the ego so that the word 'thou' may express the Witness indirectly.

द्रष्टृदृश्यत्वसंबन्धो यद्यध्यक्षेऽक्रिये कथम् ॥ ८० ॥

[1] For in the absance of a reflection, the Witness, untouched by Ignorance and its effects, cannot become an aspirant.

[2] The refutation of the *Sânkhyas* who do not accept the reflection of the Self in the intellect.

[3] The *Sânkhyas*.

[4] As the reflection is not accepted the relation cannot be ascertained.

80. (Objection). Suppose the relation is one of the seer and the seen. (Reply). How can it be with regard to the Witness which is devoid of activity ?

अक्रियत्वेऽपि तादात्म्यमध्यक्षस्य भवेद्यदि ।
आत्माध्यक्षो ममास्तीति संबन्धाग्रहणे न धीः ॥ ८१ ॥

81. If it be contended that there will be the identity of the ego and the Witness though the latter is devoid of activity (we say it cannot be so ; for) the knowledge of the said identity will not be there in the absence of the knowledge of the relation that my Self, the Witness exists.

संबन्धग्रहणं शास्त्रादिति चेन्मन्यसे नहि ।
पूर्वोक्ताः स्युस्त्रिधा दोषा ग्रहो वा स्यान्ममेति च ॥ ८२ ॥

82. If you think that the relation will be known from the scriptures[1] it cannot be so. For (in that case) all the three[2] defects spoken of before will arise. (And if there be a knowledge of the relation at all) it will be one of 'mine' (but not of identity).

अदृशिर्दृशिरूपेण भाति बुद्धिर्यदा तदा ।
प्रत्यया अपि तस्याः स्युस्तप्तायोविस्फुलिङ्गवत् ॥ ८३ ॥

83. When it is accepted that the non-conscious intellect appears to be conscious its modifications also appear to be so like sparks of red-hot iron.[3]

[1] Chh. U., 3. 14. 3.
[2] (1) The ego cannot know the relation as it is non-conscious, (2) the same is the case with the Witness as it is changeless and (3) the non-conscious ego cannot be taught by the *Sruti*.
[3] It is the conclusion.

आभासस्तदभावश्च दृशेः सीम्नो न चान्यथा ।
लोकस्य युक्तितः स्यातां तद्ग्रहश्च तथासति ॥ ८४ ॥

84. The knowledge on the part of the people of the appearance and disappearance of the mental modifications is reasonably possible only on account of (the existence of) the Witness, the limit[1] and not in the contrary case. And in that case (viz., if the reflection of the Self is accepted) the intellect[2] may know itself to be *Brahman*.

नन्वेवं दृशिसंक्रान्तिरयःपिण्डेऽग्निवद्भवेत् ।
मुखाभासवदित्येतदादर्शे तन्निराकृतम् ॥ ८५ ॥

85. (Objection). Is it not a change on the part of the Self to pervade the intellect like fire pervading a mass of iron ? (Reply). We have refuted[3] this in the example of the face and its reflection in a mirror.

कृष्णायोलोहिताभासमित्येतद्दृष्टमुच्यते ।
दृष्टदार्ष्टान्ततुल्यत्वं न तु सर्वात्मना क्वचित् ॥ ८६ ॥

86. That black iron appears to be red is only an example (to illustrate the fact that the non-conscious intellect appears to be conscious). An illustration and its subject can nowhere be absolutely similar in all respects.

तथैव चेतनाभासं चित्तं चैतन्यवद्भवेत् ।
मुखाभासो यथादर्शे आभासश्चोदितो मृषा ॥ ८७ ॥

[1] For It is left over when everything else is negated.
[2] See verse 29.
[3] See verses 33 and 43 above.

87. Reflecting Consciousness, therefore, the intellect appears to be conscious like a mirror reflecting a face and appearing like it. It has already[1] been said that the reflection is not real.

चित्तं चेतनमित्येतच्छास्त्रयुक्तिविवर्जितम् ।
देहस्यापि प्रसङ्गः स्याच्चक्षुरादेस्तथैव च ॥ ८८ ॥

88. It is not supported by the scriptures or reasoning that the intellect is conscious. For in that case the body, the eye, etc. also would be so.

तदप्यस्त्विति चेत्तन्न लोकायतिकसंगतेः ।
न च धीर्दृशिरस्मीति यद्याभासो न चेतसि ॥ ८९ ॥

89. (Objection). Let them be so.
(Reply). No. For (in that case) the position of the *chârvâka* philosophers comes in. Moreover the knowledge, 'I am *Brahman*' also will not be possible[2] if there be no reflection (of the Self) in the intellect.

सदस्मीति धियोऽभावे व्यर्थं स्यात्तत्त्वमस्यपि ।
युष्मदस्मद्विभागज्ञे स्यादर्थवदिदं वचः ॥ ९० ॥

90. The teaching 'Thou art That' will surely be useless in the absence of the knowledge, 'I am *Brahman*'. This teaching is of use to those only who are acquainted with the discrimination[3] between the Self and the non-Self.

[1] See verse 43 above.
[2] For the Self is changeless and the intellect is non-conscious. See also verse 29.
[3] See the four following verses, verses 96—98 and 181—183 of this chapter. See also Ch. 6.

ममेदंप्रत्ययौ ज्ञेयौ युष्मद्येव न संशयः ।
अहमित्यस्मदीष्टः स्यादयमस्मीति चोभयोः ॥ ९१ ॥

91. 'Mine' and 'it' are ideas predicated of the non-Self and the idea 'I' of the ego.[1] The ideas such as, 'I am a man' are predicated of both the Self[2] and the non-Self.

अन्योन्यापेक्षया तेषां प्रधानगुणतेष्यते ।
विशेषणविशेष्यत्वं तथा ग्राह्यं हि युक्तितः ॥ ९२ ॥

92. They[3] should be regarded as principal and subordinate with relation to one another and be taken as the qualified or qualifying according to reason.

ममेदं द्वयमप्येतन्मध्यमस्य विशेषणम् ।
धनी गोमान्यथा तद्वद्देहोऽहंकर्तुरेव च ॥ ९३ ॥

93. Both the ideas 'mine' and 'it' are qualifications[4] of the ego,[5] as for example, 'a man having wealth' and 'a man having a cow[5]'; similarly, the gross body is the qualification of the ego.[6]

बुद्ध्यारूढं सदा सर्वं साहंकर्त्रा च साक्षिणः ।
तस्मात्सर्वावभासो ज्ञः किंचिदप्यस्पृशन्सदा ॥ ९४ ॥

[1] Which appears like the Self through the reflection.
[2] The empirical Self, the ego.
[3] The ideas about the empirical Self and the non-Self.
[4] In relation to the idea, 'I am a man'. Wealth or a cow described as 'it' is described as 'mine' in relation to One's gross body.
[5] Spoken of in the middle of verse 91.
[6] The empirical Self described as my Self. The ego again is the qualification of the innermost Self when one says 'I am the Witness.'

94. Everything[1] pervaded by the intellect together with the ego[2] is the qualification of the Witness. Without being connected with anything and pervading everything by means of Its reflection the Self is, therefore, always of the nature of Knowledge Itself.[3]

प्रतिलोममिदं सर्वं यथोक्तं लोकबुद्धितः ।
अविवेकधियामस्ति नास्ति सर्वं विवेकिनाम् ॥ ९५ ॥

95. All this, described according to popular ideas is the reverse (of what is true) and exists for the undiscriminating; it[4] does not exist at all for men of Knowledge.

अन्वयव्यतिरेकौ हि पदार्थस्य पदस्य च ।
स्यादेतदहमित्यत्र युक्तिरेवावधारणे ॥ ९६ ॥

96. Agreement[5] and contrariety[5] with regard to words and with regard to their meanings are the only

[1] The gross body and things connected with it.
[2] Including the whole of the subtle body.
[3] This (verses 91—94) is how the Self is discriminated from the non-Self. See verse 90 above.
[4] Everything described as qualification in the two previous verses.
[5] The Self is always the witness and never ceases to exist. It is self-existent and never a qualification. (See verse 94 above), It is, therefore, real.
The ego etc. that are witnessed by the Self and depend for their existence on It are always of the nature of qualifications. (See verse 94 above). They are, therefore, unreal.
These are what are called agreement and contrariety with regard to the meanings of the words.
The words such as Self, Existence, Knowledge, Bliss, etc. imply Pure Consciousness. They are neither qualifications nor denote anything qualified.
The words agent, experiencer, knower, thin, fat and so on do not denote Pure Consciousness. They are applied to the Self when the body, the senses, etc. qualify It.
These are what are called agreement and contrariety with regard to words.

means by which the meaning implied by the word 'I' may be ascertained.[1]

नाद्राक्षमहमित्यस्मिन्सुषुप्तेऽन्यन्मनागपि ।
न वारयति दृष्टिं स्वां प्रत्ययं तु निषेधति ॥ ९७ ॥

97. (Waking up from deep sleep one says) 'I did not see anything at all in that state.' (From this it is clear that) one denies the existence of the mental modifications, (the *knower*, *knowing* and the *known*) in deep sleep but not that of *Knowledge* Itself.

स्वयंज्योतिर्न हि द्रष्टुरित्येवं संविदोऽस्तिताम् ।
स्वयमेवाब्रवीच्छास्त्रं प्रत्ययावगती पृथक् ॥ ९८ ॥

98. The scriptures themselves discriminate between Knowledge Itself on the one hand, and the mental modifications, (the knower, knowing and the known) on the other and prove that the former is changeless and really existing and that the latter deviate from existence, as they say 'It is self-luminous[2]' and 'The Knowledge[3] of the knower does not (cease to exist).'

एवं विज्ञातवाक्यार्थे श्रुतिलोकप्रसिद्धितः ।
श्रुतिस्तत्त्वमसीत्याह श्रोतुर्मोहापनुत्तये ॥ ९९ ॥
ब्रह्मा दाशरथेर्यद्वदुक्त्यैवापानुदत्तमः ।
तस्य विष्णुत्वसंबोधे न यत्नान्तरमूचिवान् ॥ १०० ॥

[1] But not the absolute oneness of the meanings of the word, 'thou' and 'that'. See verse 99 of this chapter.

[2] Br. U., 4. 3. 9.

[3] Br. U., 4. 3. 23.

99, 100. Just as *Brahmâ* removed the Ignorance[1] of the son of *Dasaratha* by means of words[2] only, but did not teach him any action in order that he might know that he was *Vishnu* ; so, in order that one's Ignorance may be removed the *Sruti*, teaches one 'Thou art That' when one has learnt the meanings of the subordinate sentences[3] according to the *Srutis*[4] and popular grammar.

अहंशब्दस्य निष्ठा या ज्योतिषि प्रत्यगात्मनि ।
सैवोक्ता सदसीत्येवं फलं तत्र विमुक्तता ॥ १०१ ॥

101. It is the indirectly expressed meaning of the word 'I' viz., the innermost and self-luminous Self which is expressed in the teaching, 'Thou art That.' And the result is liberation.[5]

श्रुतमात्रेण चेन्न स्यात्कार्यं तत्र भवेद्ध्रुवम्
व्यवहारात्पुरापीष्टः सद्भावः स्वयमात्मनः ॥ १०२ ॥

102. It would surely be necessary to admit an injunction[6] if right knowledge were not produced immediately when one was taught (that one was *Brahman*). The

[1] It was assumed by him out of his own accord in order to veil his Powers for some time.
[2] The words are :—you are Vishnu and not the son of Dasaratha.
[3] E.g., Existence, Knowledge, Unlimited *Brahman*. See Tai. U., 2. 1.
[4] And thus has learnt the meaning implied by the word 'I'.
[5] When the knowledge, 'I am *Brahman*' arises on being taught 'Thou art That.'
[6] E.g., an injunction regarding the mental repetition of the idea. 'I am *Brahman*'. See verses 9—18 of this chapter to which this is a reply.

Self[1] exists in Its own nature even before[2] one is taught (the meaning of the sentence, 'Thou art That').

अशनायादिनिर्मुक्त्यै तत्काला जायते प्रमा ।
तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्यार्थे त्रिषु कालेऽप्यसंशयः ॥ १०३ ॥

103. The listening to the teaching and the production of right knowledge are simultaneous, and the result is the cessation[3] of (the transmigratory existence consisting of) hunger etc. There can be no[4] doubt about the meaning of the sentences like 'Thou art That' in the past, present or future.

प्रतिबन्धविहीनत्वात्स्वयं चानुभवात्मनः ।
जायेतैव प्रमा तत्र स्वात्मन्येव न संशयः ॥ १०४ ॥

104. The right knowledge of the Self which is of the nature of Pure Consciousness is, no doubt, produced in one at the time (of listening to the teaching) as all obstacles are removed[5] (beforehand).

[1] The *Sruti* is the right evidence regarding the knowledge of the eternally existing Self. It cannot, therefore, be said that a wrong knowledge, a futile knowledge, a doubtful knowledge or no knowledge is produced from the sentence. Verses 102—104 refute these objections.

[2] So the knowledge arising from the *Sruti* is not wrong.

[3] Which is directly felt and therefore the knowledge is not futile.

[4] It is felt that one is *Brahman* in the past, present and future. The knowledge is, therefore, not doubtful.

[5] Through the method of agreement and contrariety. See verses 96 and 97 above.

The ignorance of the implied meanings of the words, 'thou' and 'that' is the only obstacle to the right knowledge of Self-*Brahman*.

It cannot, therefore, be said that no knowledge is produced.

किं सदेवाहमस्मीति किंवान्यत्प्रतिपद्यते ।
सदेव चेदहंशब्दः सता मुख्यार्थ इष्यताम् ॥ १०५ ॥
अन्यश्चेत्सदहंप्राहप्रतिपत्तिर्मृषैव सा ।
तस्मान्मुख्यग्रहे नास्ति वारणावगतेरिह ॥ १०६ ॥

105, 106. Does one understand the word 'I' to mean *Brahman*, Itself or something other than It (when one is taught 'Thou art Brahman'?) If it is understood to mean *Brahman* Itself you must accept the absolute identity[1] of the meaning of the word 'I' and that of the word *Brahman*. But if (the word 'I' imply something) other than *Brahman* the knowledge, 'I am *Brahman*' certainly becomes false. The arising of the knowledge of their absolute identity from this sentence cannot, therefore, be denied.

प्रत्ययी प्रत्ययश्चैव यदाभासौ तदर्थता ।
तयोरचितिमत्त्वाच्च चैतन्ये कल्प्यते फलम् ॥ १०७ ॥

107. Having the reflection of the Self in them the intellect and its modifications exist[2] for It and are non-conscious.[2] (Liberation,) the result is, therefore, supposed to be in the conscious Self.

कूटस्थेऽपि फलं योग्यं राजनीव जयादिकम् ।
तद्नात्मत्वहेतुभ्यां क्रियायाः प्रत्ययस्य च ॥ १०८ ॥

108. As neither the intellect (with the reflection of the Self) nor its modification in the form of the ego is of the nature of the result[3] or its (material)

[1] Directly expressed by the word 'art' the copula in the sentence 'Thou art *Brahman*'.

[2] Therefore they cannot be connected with liberation, the result of right knowledge.

[3] Liberation.

cause the result is capable of being attributed to the Self though immutable, like victory to a King.

आदर्शस्तु यदाभासो मुखाकारः स एव सः ।
यथैवं प्रत्ययादर्शो यदाभासस्तदा ह्यहम् ॥ १०९ ॥

109. Just as the reflection of a face which makes a mirror appear like it, is the face itself,[1] so, the reflection of the Self in the mirror of the ego making it appear like the Self (is the Self).[2] So (the meaning of the sentence,) 'I am *Brahman*' (is reasonable).

इत्येवं प्रतिपत्तिः स्यात्सदस्मीति च नान्यथा ।
तत्त्वमित्युपदेशोऽपि द्वाराभावादनर्थकः ॥ ११० ॥

110. It is only in this way[3] and in no other that one knows that one is *Brahman* (and that *Brahman* is oneself). Otherwise the teaching, 'Thou art That' also becomes useless in the absence of a medium.[4]

श्रोतुः स्यादुपदेशश्चेदर्थवत्त्वं तथा भवेत्
अध्यक्षस्य न चेदिष्टं श्रोतृत्वं कस्य तद्भवेत् ॥ १११ ॥

111. Teaching becomes useful if it is meant for a hearer (i.e. the aspirant). Who will be the hearer if the Witness is not?

अध्यक्षस्य समीपे स्याद्बुद्धेरेवेति चेन्मतम् ।
न तत्कृतोपकारोऽस्ति काष्ठाद्यद्वन्न कल्प्यते ॥ ११२ ॥

[1] Not different from the face. [2] Not different from the Self.
[3] I.e., when the reflection of the Self is accepted. See verse 78 above. [4] The reflection of the Self.

112. If you are of opinion that the intellect proximate to the Witness[1] is the hearer it cannot be regarded as deriving any benefit from the Witness) as from a piece of wood.

बुद्धौ चेत्तत्कृतः कश्चिन्नन्वेवं परिणामिता ।
आभासेऽपि च को दोषः सति श्रुत्याद्यनुग्रहे ॥ ११३ ॥

113. But the Witness must be admitted to be subject to change if there be any benefit rendered by It to the intellect.

What harm is there if the reflection of the Self is accepted as it is supported by the *Srutis*[2] and *Smritis*?[3]

आभासे परिणामश्चेन्न रज्ज्वादिनिभत्ववत् ।
सर्पादेश्च तथावोचमादर्शे च मुखत्ववत् ॥ ११४ ॥

114. If you say that there will be changes in the Self in case the reflection is accepted we say 'No.' For we have already said (that the reflection of Consciousness in the intellect is an unreality) like a snake appearing to be a rope and (like the reflection of a face) in a mirror appearing to be the face itself.

नात्माभासत्वसिद्धिश्चेद्दात्मनो ग्रहणात्पृथक् ।
मुखादेश्च पृथक्सिद्धिरिह त्वन्योन्यसंश्रयः ॥ ११५ ॥
अध्यक्षस्य पृथक्सिद्धावाभासस्य तदीयता ।
आभासस्य तदीयत्वे ह्यध्यक्षव्यतिरिक्तता ॥ ११६ ॥

[1] Which only exists and is actionless.
[2] Br. U., 2. 5. 19.
[3] Bh. Gitâ, 15. 7.

115, 116. (Objection). No. There will be the fallacy of reciprocal dependence here as the knowlege of the reflection depends on that of the Self (and the knowledge of the Self depends on that of the reflection); (but it is not so in the case of the face etc. and their reflections) as the face etc. are always known independent of their reflections.

The reflection may be said to belong to the Self if the latter be known to have an independent existence. Again, the Self may have an independent existence if the reflection belongs to It.[1]

नैवं स्वप्ने पृथक्सिद्धेः प्रत्ययस्य दृशेस्तथा ।
रथादेस्तत्र शून्यत्वात्प्रत्ययस्यात्मना ग्रहः ॥ ११७ ॥

117. (Reply). It is not[2] so. For the intellect and the Self are known to exist independent of each other in dream (like the face and its reflection), as the Self then illumines the modifications (of the intellect) in the forms of objects such as, chariots[3] etc. though they are not present in that state.

अवगत्या हि संव्याप्तः प्रत्ययो विषयाकृतिः ।
जायते, स यदाकारः स बाह्यो विषयो मतः ॥ ११८ ॥
कर्मेप्सिततमत्वात्स तद्वान्कार्ये नियुज्यते ।
आकारो यत्र चार्प्येत करणं तदिहोच्यते ॥ ११९ ॥

[1] The fallacy spoken of in verse 115 is explained here.
[2] The intellect is an object of the Self (Pure Consciousness) in dream. The Self must, therefore, be admitted to have an existence independent of that of Its reflection.
[3] See Br. U., 4. 3. 9.

118, 119. Pervaded by Consciousness mental modifications in the forms of objects come into existence. External objects are what impart their forms to these modifications. The most desirable of all things (on the part of the agent), these external objects are called objects of his action. One having such a desire is enjoined to perform actions. The mental modifications in which the forms of external objects are present are called the instruments of his knowledge of objects.[1]

यदाभासेन संव्याप्तः संज्ञातेति निगद्यते ।
त्रयमेतद्विविच्यात्र यो जानाति स आत्मवित् ॥ १२० ॥

120. The ego which is pervaded by the reflection of Consciousness is called the knower or the agent of the action of knowing. One who knows oneself, the witness to be distinct from all these three[2] is a (real) knower of the Self.

सम्यक्संशयमिथ्योक्ताः प्रत्यया व्यभिचारिणः ।
एकैवावगतिस्तेषु भेदस्तु प्रत्ययार्पितः ॥ १२१ ॥

121. The modifications of the intellect, called 'right knowledge,' 'doubtful knowledge' and 'false knowledge,' deviate from their existence. There is one and the same Consciousness[3] in all of them. The differences are due to the modifications.

[1] In verses 118—122 the Self is shown in the waking state to be distinct from the intellect as It is shown to be so in dream in verse 117.
[2] The agent, the object and the instrument.
[3] Pure Consciousness, the Self.

आधिभेदाद्यथा भेदो मणेरवगतेस्तथा ।
अशुद्धिः परिणामश्च सर्वं प्रत्ययसंश्रयात् ॥ १२२ ॥

122. Just as a jewel differs in colour owing to the proximity of (coloured) things, so, Consciousness differs (according to different modifications of the mind superimposed on It). Impurities and changes in the Self are all due to Its connection with these modifications.

प्रथनं ग्रहणं सिद्धिः प्रत्ययानामिहान्यतः ।
आपरोक्ष्यात्तदेवोक्तमनुमानं प्रदीपवत् ॥ १२३ ॥

123. The modifications of the intellect are manifested, known and endowed with existence[1] by another, i.e. the Self which is immediately known and different from them. It is inferred with the help of the example of a lamp.[2]

किमन्यद्ग्राहयेत्कश्चित्प्रमाणेन तु केनचित् ।
विनैव तु प्रमाणेन निवृत्त्यान्यस्य शेषतः ॥ १२४ ॥

124. Does one make another accept the Self by means of a positive evidence or without one by merely negating the non-Self and leaving over the Self only?[3]

शब्देनैव प्रमाणेन निवृत्तिश्चेदिहोच्यते ।
अध्यक्षस्याप्रसिद्धत्वाच्छून्यतैव प्रसज्यते ॥ १२५ ॥

[1] Kath. U. 5. 15. [2] The discussion begun here ends in verse 140.
[3] After stating that the Self is proved by positive evidence in verse 123 the author refutes in verses 124-140 the doctrine that It is proved by negative evidence only.

125. The possibility of a void comes in owing to the witness being unknown[1] if the non-Self be meant to be negated by means of the evidence of words.[2]

चेतनस्त्वं कथं देह इति चेन्नाप्रसिद्धितः ।
चेतनस्यान्यतः सिद्धावेवं स्यादन्यहानतः ॥ १२६ ॥

126. (Objection). 'You are a conscious being, how[3] can you be the body?'

(Reply). It cannot be so proved as the Self is not known (from any other evidence). It might be proved by negating the non-Self if Pure Conciousness were known to exist through an evidence.

अध्यक्षः स्वयमस्त्येव चेतनस्यापरोक्षतः ।
तुल्य एवं प्रबोधः स्यादन्यस्यासत्त्ववादिना ॥ १२७ ॥

127. (Objection). The Self is self-existent as Pure Consciousness is immediately known. (Reply). The knowledge of the Self (according to you) then becomes similar[4] to that of the void assumed by the Nihilist.

अहमज्ञासिषं चेदमिति लोकस्मृतेरिह ।
करणं कर्म कर्ता च सिद्धास्त्वेकक्षणे किल ॥ १२८ ॥

128. (Objection). That the agent, the object and instrument are known to exist simultaneously is proved by memory, (e.g., when one says) 'I[5] knew it.'

[1] By any other evidence. [2] The *Srutis*.

[3] The idea is that the Self and the non-Self being contradictory to each other, the former is left over when the latter is negated.

[4] As regards the want of an evidence.

[5] The objector tries to prove the independent existence of the Self by showing that there must be a Self-evident principle through which the three things are known simultaneously. And that is the Self.

प्रामाण्येऽपि स्मृतेः शैघ्र्याद्यौगपद्यं विभाव्यते ।
क्रमेण ग्रहणं पूर्वं स्मृतेः पश्चात्तथैव च ॥ १२९ ॥

129. (Reply).[1] Though memory is a right evidence simultaneity is a misconception due to quick perception. So they were perceived before one after another and afterwards remembered in the same way.

अज्ञासिषमिदं मां चेत्यपेक्षा जायते ध्रुवम् ।
विशेषोऽपेक्ष्यते यत्र तत्र नैवैककालता ॥ १३० ॥

130. Relative to, and characteristically different from, each other the things denoted by the words 'it' and 'myself' in the sentence, 'I knew it and myself', cannot be the objects of simultaneous perception.

आत्मनो ग्रहणे चापि त्रयाणामिह संभवात् ।
आत्मन्यासक्तकर्तृत्वं न स्यात्करणकर्मणोः ॥ १३१ ॥

131. Three things (namely, an agent, an instrument and an object) are necessary in the perception of each[2] one of the knower, knowledge and the known. (And in order to avoid a *regressus ad infinitum* it cannot be said that each of these three things will prove its own existence, because) the agency of the agent exhausted in proving its own existence will not be available to prove that of the instrument and the object (at the same time).

[1] Verses 129—132.

[2] And also in the perception of each one of the agent, the instrument and the object. Hence there arises a *regressus ad infinitum* with respect to each of them.

व्याप्तुमिष्टं च यत्कर्तुः क्रियया कर्म तत्स्मृतम् ।
अतो हि कर्तृतन्त्रत्वं तस्येष्टं नान्यतन्त्रता ॥ १३२ ॥

132. What is desired to be governed by the action of an agent is an object of that action. The object, therefore, depends on the agent and not on the Self which is other than it.

शब्दाद्वानुमितेर्वापि प्रमाणाद्वा ततोऽन्यतः ।
सिद्धिः सर्वपदार्थानां स्यादज्ञं प्रति नान्यथा ॥ १३३ ॥

133. It is only through evidences such as, words,[1] inference, etc.[2] and in no other way that all things become known to those who do not know them.

अध्यक्षस्यापि सिद्धिः स्यात्प्रमाणेन विनैव वा ।
विना स्वस्य प्रसिद्धिस्तु ज्ञानं प्रत्युपयुज्यते ॥ १३४ ॥

134. Is the Self also[3] substantiated by means of an evidence or not? Though the Self Itself is independent of evidence, evidence is necessary in order to know It.

तस्यैवाज्ञत्वमिष्टं चेज्ज्ञानत्वेऽन्या मतिर्भवेत् ।
अन्यस्यैवाज्ञतायां च तद्विज्ञाने ध्रुवा भवेत् ॥ १३५ ॥

135. If the conscious Self Itself is taken to be ignorant an evidence is necessary,[4] in order that It may know Itself to be so. It is surely necessary[4] in knowing the Self if one[4] (i.e. the ego) other than It be regarded as ignorant.

[1] The *Sruti*. [2] E.g., sense-perception. [3] Like the non-Self.
[4] In both the cases, therefore, a positive evidence is necessary.

ज्ञातता स्वात्मलाभो वा सिद्धिः स्यादन्यदेव वा ।
ज्ञातत्वेऽनन्तरोक्तौ त्वं पक्षौ संस्मर्तुमर्हसि ॥ १३६ ॥
सिद्धिः स्यात्स्वात्मलाभश्चेद्यत्नस्तत्र निरर्थकः ।
सर्वलोकप्रसिद्धत्वात्स्वहेतुभ्यस्तु वस्तुनः ॥ १३७ ॥

136, 137. Does substantiation [1] mean being known, being endowed with existence or anything else [2] ? You should remember the two alternatives spoken of in the previous verse if it means 'being known'.

As it is well-known that all things come to existence from their causes no effort (by way of the application of an evidence [3]) is necessary for substantiation.

ज्ञानज्ञेयादिवादेऽतः सिद्धिर्ज्ञातत्वमुच्यते ।
अध्यक्ष्याध्यक्षयोः सिद्धिर्ज्ञेयत्वं नात्मलाभता ॥ १३८ ॥

138. Substantiation, therefore, means 'being known' according to the doctrine in which the knower, knowing and the known are admitted. In the case of both the witness and the witnessed it denotes 'being known' and not 'endowed with existence.'

स्पष्टत्वं कर्मकर्त्रादेः सिद्धिता यदि कल्प्यते ।
स्पष्टताऽस्पष्टते स्यातामन्यस्यैव न चात्मनः ॥ १३९ ॥

139. If it be assumed [4] that the distinctness of the agent, the object, etc. is what is substantiation (We

[1] See verse 134 above. [2] See verse 139.

[3] Even a negative evidence upheld by the objector is not necessary. So this alternative is refuted.

[4] By the *Bhâttas*.

say that) there can be distinctness[1] and indistinctness with respect to the other (i.e., the witness) only, but not the agent.[2]

अद्रष्टुर्नैव चान्धस्य स्पष्टीभावो घटस्य तु ।
कर्त्रादेः स्पष्टतेष्टा चेद्द्रष्टृताऽभ्यक्षकर्तृता ॥ १४० ॥

140. There is no distinctness of a jar to a blind man having no power of vision. (It is nothing more than the jar being *known*.[3]) If, however, they[4] want to predicate distinctness about the agent etc., they must admit that Knowingness belongs to the Self.[5]

अनुभूतेः किमन्यस्मिन्स्यात्तत्रापेक्षया वद ।
अनुभवितरीष्टा स्यात्सोऽप्यनुभूतिरेव नः ॥ १४१ ॥

141. Please tell us[6] what benefit you derive by holding that knowledge depends on other things. If it is contended that dependence (of knowledge) on the knower is desirable (we reply that) the knower also, according to us, is nothing but Knowledge.

अभिन्नोऽपि हि बुद्ध्यात्मा विपर्यासितदर्शनैः ।
ग्राह्यग्राहकसंवित्तिभेदवानिव लक्ष्यते ॥ १४२ ॥

142. The intellect itself, though indivisible, is looked upon by deluded people as consisting of the divisions of the knower, knowing and the known.

[1] When the Self is reflected in the intellect etc.
[2] Because the agent, the object, etc. are non-conscious by nature.
[3] Therefore substantiation does not mean distinctness.
[4] The *Bhâttas*. [5] Different from the agent. Here ends the discussion begun in verse 123 of this chapter.
[6] The Idealists.

भूतिर्येषां क्रिया सैव कारकं सैव चोच्यते ।
सत्त्वं नाशित्वमस्याश्चेत्सकर्तृत्वं तथेष्यताम् ॥ १४३ ॥

143. Actions, agents etc. consist, according to us, (Idealists), of knowledge only.

(Reply). You must accept an agent of this knowledge if you admit its existence and destruction (every moment).[1]

न कश्चिच्चेष्यते धर्म इति चेत्पक्षहानता ।
नन्वस्तित्वादयो धर्मा नास्तित्वादिनिवृत्तयः ।
न भूतेस्तर्हि नाशित्वं स्वालक्षण्यं मतं हि ते ॥ १४४ ॥

144. Your own conclusion is given up if you do not admit any quality[2] (belonging to knowledge). (Objection). The qualities of existence etc. are nothing but the negation of their non-existence and so on. (Reply). Even then knowledge cannot be liable to destruction (every moment) as it is self-existent (and known by itself[3]) according to you.

स्वलक्षणावधिर्नाशो नाशोऽनाशनिवृत्तिता ।
अगोरसत्त्वं गोत्वं ते न तु तद्गोत्वलक्षणम् ॥ १४५ ॥

145. Destruction has for its ultimate limit something which is self-existent.[4] (You say that) destruction[5] is

[1] See verse 23, Chap. 16.
[2] Such as, existence and destruction every moment.
[3] In being born and known by itself it requires more than one moment. It cannot, therefore, be called momentary.
[4] The appearance and disappearance of things are impossible on account of the absence of a permanent entity (according to you) which must be their ultimate limit. Existence and destruction are, therefore, not possible in your philosophy.
[5] Destruction being impossible, non-destruction also is so.

the negation of non-destruction. A cow is defined according to you as the non-existence of a non-cow. It cannot be the definition of a cow.

क्षणवाच्योऽपि योऽर्थः स्यात्सोऽप्यन्याभाव एव ते ॥ १४६॥

146. Things denoted by the word 'momentary' are also, according to you, only the negation of things that are non-momentary.[1]

भेदाभावेऽप्यभावस्य भेदो नामभिरिष्यते ।
नामभेदैरनेकत्वमेकस्य स्यात्कथं तव ॥ १४७ ॥

147. (The Idealists). As there cannot be any difference in non-existence[2] differences are due to names only. (Reply). Please, tell me how there can be manyness in one (indivisible non-existence) due only to different names.

अपोहो यदि भिन्नानां वृत्तिस्तस्य कथं गवि ।
नाभावा भेदकाः सर्वे विशेषा वा कथंचन ॥ १४८ ॥

148. How[3] can the negation (of a non-cow) denote a cow if by the word negation the negation of different things is meant? (Again) no negation[4] distinguishes one thing from another, nor can special properties[5] do it.

[1] You have, therefore, to accept a permanent real entity.

[2] The Idealist means to say that his negation is not that of a reality.

[3] For there is no limit to the number of things denoted by the word non-cow. All of them cannot, therefore, be known. So a cow cannot be defined.

[4] E.g., the negation of a horse or that of a goat does not distinguish a cow from either of them.

[5] E.g., hornlessness etc. See the next verse.

नामजात्यादयो यद्वत्संविदस्तेऽविशेषतः ॥ १४९ ॥

149. Just as names, species, etc. do not qualify Knowledge) according to you as it has no special properties, (so, the negation of a non-cow, hornlessness etc. do not qualify a cow).

प्रत्यक्षमनुमानं वा व्यवहारे यदीच्छसि ।
क्रियाकारकभेदैस्तदभ्युपेयं ध्रुवं भवेत् ॥ १५० ॥

150. You have to admit difference as you have to accept sense-perception and inference consisting of actions, agents and so on in everyday life.

तस्मान्नीलं तथा पीतं घटादिर्वा विशेषणम् ।
संविदस्तदुपेयं स्याद्येन चाप्यनुभूयते ॥ १५१ ॥

151. Entities qualifying knowledge such as, jars, blue, yellow, etc. and also the knower by which these are known must be accepted.[1]

रूपादीनां यथान्यः स्याद्ग्राह्यत्वाद्ग्राहकस्तथा ।
प्रत्यगस्तत्तथान्यः स्याद्धयञ्जकत्वात्प्रदीपवत् ॥ १५२ ॥

152. Just as the perceiver is different from colours etc. which are perceivable, so, the Knower, the Self, is different from the modifications of the intellect which are knowable. (Again) just as a lamp revealing things

[1] Here ends the refutation of the Idealists begun in verse 141 above.
Hence in addition to knowledge the knower and the known also must be accepted. See verses 141 and 142.

is different from them, so, the Knower is different from things known.

अध्यक्षस्य दृशेः कीदृक्संबन्धः संभविष्यति ।
अध्यक्षेण[1] तु दृश्येन मुक्त्वान्यो द्रष्टृदृश्यताम् ॥ १५३ ॥
अध्यक्षेण कृता दृष्टिर्दृश्यं व्याप्नोत्यथापि वा ।
नित्याध्यक्षकृतः कश्चिदुपकारो भवेद्धियाम् ॥ १५४ ॥

153, 154. What other relation except that of the seer and the seen can there be between the Self, the Witness and the modifications of the intellect witnessed by It ?

(Question :) Does the consciousness of the Self pervade the modifications (really[2] or apparently) ?

(Answer). If apparently, the eternal Self must be of some utility[3] to the intellect.

स चोक्तस्तन्निभत्वं प्राक्संव्याप्तिश्च घटादिषु ।
यथालोकादिसंव्याप्तिर्व्यञ्जकत्वाद्धियस्तथा ॥ १५५ ॥

155. It has been said before[4] that the benefit derived from (the proximity of) the Self by the intellect is that it appears conscious like the former. Being a revealer the intellect[5] pervading objects like light and so on pervading jars etc.

आलोकस्थो घटो यद्वद्बुद्ध्यारूढो भवेत्तथा ।
धीव्याप्तिः स्याद्घटारोहो धियो व्याप्तौ क्रमो भवेत् ॥ १५६ ॥

[1] The reading should perhaps be अध्यक्ष्येण.

[2] Real pervasion is impossible as the Self is changeless.

[3] See the following verse.

[4] Verse 87 above.

[5] The Self is thus related to external objects through Its reflection.

156. Just as a jar[1] placed in the sun may be said to be mounted on light, so, an object in the intellect may be said to be mounted on it. Being mounted is nothing but being pervaded by the intellect. Objects become pervaded by the intellect one after another.

पूर्वं स्यात्प्रत्ययव्याप्तिस्ततोऽनुग्रह आत्मनः ।
कृत्स्नाध्यक्षस्य नो युक्तः कालाकाशादिवत्क्रमः ॥ १५७ ॥

157. The intellect pervades an object (and assumes its form) when the object is revealed through the help (i.e., the reflection) of the Self. Like time and space the all-pervading Self[2] can have no order or succession (in pervading objects).

विषयग्रहणं यस्य कारणापेक्षया भवेत् ।
सत्येवं ग्राह्यशेषे च परिणामी स चित्तवत् ॥ १५८ ॥

158. A thing like the intellect that depends on the agent etc. in pervading its objects (and does not pervade all objects at the same time,) some being always left unpervaded, is liable to transformation.

अध्यक्षोऽहमिति ज्ञानं बुद्धेरेव विनिश्चयः ।
नाध्यक्षस्याविशेषत्वान्न तस्यास्ति परो यतः ॥ १५९ ॥

159. It is to the intellect and not to the Self which is immutable that the knowledge, 'I am *Brahman*'

[1] See verse 6, chap. 14.
[2] See verse 7, chap. 14.

belongs. Moreover the Self is changeless because[1] It has no other witness.

कर्त्रा चेदहमित्येवमनुभूयेत मुक्तता ।
सुखदुःखविनिर्मोको नाहंकर्तरि युज्यते ॥ १६० ॥

160. If the agent, the ego, were to feel 'I am liberated'[2] freedom from pain and pleasure would not be reasonable[3] with respect to it.

बाध्यते प्रत्ययेनेह विवेकेनाविवेकवान् ।
देहादावभिमानोत्थो दुःखीति प्रत्ययो ध्रुवम् ।
कुण्डलीप्रत्ययो यद्वत्प्रत्यगात्माभिमानिना ॥ १६१ ॥
विपर्यासेऽसदन्तं स्यात्प्रमाणस्याप्रमाणतः ॥ १६२ ॥

161, 162. The wrong knowledge that one is happy or unhappy due to one's identification with the body etc., like the pleasure or sorrow due to the possession or loss of an ear-ring, is surely negated by the right knowledge that one is Pure Consciousness.

An evidence becoming non-evidence, everything will end in non-existence in the reverse case.[4]

दाहच्छेदविनाशेषु दुःखित्वं नान्यथात्मनः ।
नैव ह्यन्यस्य दाहादावन्यो दुःखी भवेत्कचित् ॥ १६३ ॥

163. One feels pain when one's body gets burnt, cut or destroyed, (because one identifies oneself with

[1] It is only changeful things that can have a witness. If a witness of the Self is assumed there will be a *regressus ad infinitum*.

[2] Liberation, the result, apparently belongs to the Self. (See verses 107, 108 and 109 above.)

[3] For an agent is always connected with pain and pleasure.

[4] Where wrong knowledge to negate right knowledge.

it). Otherwise the Self (which is different from the body) is never pained. Owing to there being burns etc. in one man another is not pained.

अस्पर्शत्वाददेहत्वान्नाहं दाह्यो यतः सदा ।
तस्मान्मिथ्याभिमानोत्थं मृते पुत्रे मृतिर्यथा ॥ १६४ ॥

164. As I am not touched[1] by anything and do not possess a body I am never susceptible of being burnt. Pain arises from the wrong notion (due to a false identification with the body) like the wrong notion of one being dead at the death of one's son.

कुण्डल्यहमिति ह्येतद्बाध्येतैव विवेकिना ।
दुःखीति प्रत्ययस्तद्वत्केवलाहंधिया सह ॥ १६५ ॥

165. Just as the wrong notion, ‘I possess an ear-ring’ is removed when the right[2] knowledge regarding it arises, so, the false consciousness, ‘I am unhappy’ is negated by the right knowledge, ‘I am Pure *Brahman*’.

सिद्धे दुःखित्व इष्टं स्याच्छक्तिश्छन्दसात्मनः ।
मिथ्याभिमानतो दुःखी तेनार्थापादनक्षमः ॥ १६६ ॥

166. The Self might be freely imagined to have the potentiality of pain in It if It were proved to possess pain at all. One's identification with the body etc. is the cause of the pain felt and is responsible for the idea of such a potentiality existing in It.

[1] Kath. U., 1. 3. 15.

[2] I.e., an ear-ring is a piece of gold having no connection with a man.

अस्पर्शोऽपि यथा स्पर्शमचलश्चलनादि च ।
अविवेकात्तथा दुःखं मानसं चात्मनीक्षते ॥ १६७ ॥

167. Just as, due to indiscrimination, touch and movement are felt to be in the Self (which is devoid of them), so, mental pain is also felt to be in It owing to the same reason).

विवेकात्मधिया दुःखं नुद्यते चलनादिवत् ।
अविवेकस्वभावेन मनो गच्छत्यनिच्छतः ॥ १६८ ॥
तदानुदृश्यते दुःखं नैश्चल्येनैव तस्य तत् ।
प्रत्यगात्मनि तस्मात्तद्दुःखं नैवोपपद्यते ॥ १६९ ॥

168, 169. The pain (due to one's identification with the subtle body) comes to an end like movements etc. on one's having the discriminating knowledge (that one is the Innermost Self), coming to an end (when one knows that one is different from the gross body. Unhappiness is seen in one when one's mind roams against one's will on account of Ignorance. But it is not seen in one when the mind is at rest. It is, therefore, not reasonable that unhappiness is in the innermost Self.

त्वंसतोस्तुल्यनीडत्वान्नीलाश्ववदिदं भवेत् ॥ १७० ॥

170. The saying, 'Thou art That,' (therefore) implies an indivisible reality,[1] the words 'Thou' and 'That' expressing the same reality (indirectly) like (the words 'blue' and 'horse' in) the sentence,[2] it is a blue horse.'

[1] Self-*Brahman*. [2] This example is meant to imply an indivisible thing and not a qualified one.

निर्दुःखवाचिना योगात्त्वंशब्दस्य तदर्थता ।
प्रत्यगात्माभिधानेन तच्छब्दस्य युतेस्तथा ॥ १७१ ॥

171. The word 'Thou' comes to mean one free from pain on account of its being used (in the same predicament) with the word 'That' which means One eternally devoid of pain. Similarly, used in the same connection with the word 'Thou' meaning the Innermost Self (which is directly known) the word 'That' also (comes to mean a thing directly known).

दशमस्त्वमसीत्येवं वाक्यं स्यात्प्रत्यगात्मनि ॥ १७२ ॥

172. The sentence, ('Thou art That' produces the immediate knowledge) of Self-Brahman like the saying,[1] 'You are the tenth.'

स्वार्थस्य ह्यप्रहाणेन विशिष्टार्थसमर्पकौ ।
प्रत्यगात्मावगत्यन्तौ नान्योऽर्थोऽर्थाद्विरोध्यतः ॥ १७३ ॥

173. Without giving up their own meanings[2] the words, ('thou' and 'That') deliver (by implication) a special one[3] resulting in the knowledge of Self-Brahman. They do not express any other[4] meaning contrary to it.

[1] See foot-note 2, verse 3, chap. 12.

[2] Direct meanings. The direct meaning of the word 'thou' is Pure Consciousness with the intellect and the reflection of Consciousness in it. The direct meaning of the word 'That' is Pure Consciousness with Mâyâ (Primeval Ignorance) and the reflection of Consciousness in it.

[3] A Being indivisible and of the nature of Bliss only, Self-*Brahman*.

[4] I.e., One connected with or qualified by anything else. See Sankarâchârya's '*Vâkya Vritti*' verse 38.

नवबुद्ध्यपहाराद्धि स्वात्मानं दशपूरणम् ।
अपश्यञ्ज्ञातुमेवेच्छेत्स्वमात्मानं जनस्तथा ॥ १७४ ॥
अविद्याबद्धचक्षुष्ट्वात्कामापहृतधीः सदा ।
विविक्तं दृशिमात्मानं नेक्षते दशमं यथा ॥ १७५ ॥

174, 175. Just as misled by the number nine the boy[1] did not know the truth i.e., himself and wanted to know himself, so, one does not see one's own Self, the Witness, though detached from the non-Self and self-evident, on account of one's eyes being covered by Ignorance and intellect captivated by desires.

दशमस्त्वमसीत्येवं तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्यतः ।
स्वमात्मानं विजानाति कृत्स्नान्तःकरणेक्षणम् ॥ १७६ ॥

176. One knows one's own Self, the witness of the intellect[2] and all its modifications, from sentences such as, 'Thou art That' like the boy who knew himself from the sentence, 'You are the tenth.'

इदं पूर्वमिदं पश्चात्पदं वाक्यं भवेदिति ।
अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां ततो वाक्यार्थबोधनम् ॥ १७७ ॥
वाक्ये हि श्रूयमाणानां पदानामर्थसंस्मृतिः ।
नियमो नैव वेदेऽस्ति पदसांगत्यमर्थतः ॥ १७८ ॥

177, 178. The understanding of sentences[3] is possible (on the knowledge of the implied meanings of the words) after it has been ascertained by the method of

[1] See foot-note 2, *verse* 3, chapter 12. [2] Including the ego.
[3] I.e., the understanding of the meaning of the word 'Thou' to be the meaning of the word 'That'.

agreement and contrariety which words should be placed first[1] and which next.

For the order of words in *Vedic* sentences follows[2] the meaning of the sentences. No rule about (the order of) remembering the meanings of words in sentences holds good in the *Vedas.*

यदा नित्येषु वाक्येषु पदार्थस्तु विविच्यते ।
वाक्यार्थज्ञानसंक्रान्त्यै तदा प्रश्नो न युज्यते ॥ १७९ ॥

179. The question[3] is out of place when the meanings of words in sentences[4] having fixed meanings are made clear[5] in order that the meanings of sentences may be comprehended.

अन्वयव्यतिरेकोक्तिः पदार्थस्मरणाय तु ।
स्मृत्यभावे न वाक्यार्थो ज्ञातुं शक्यो हि केनचित् ॥ १८० ॥

180. The method of agreement[6] and contrariety is spoken of in order that one may be acquainted with the (implied) meanings of words. For no one can know the meaning of a sentence without knowing (the meanings of the words in it).

[1] In construing sentences we place the words having known meanings, 'I', 'thou', etc. first and 'That,' '*Brahman*', etc. next, which have unknown meanings.

[2] In the *Vedic* statement, 'oblations should be offered to fire', 'barley gruel should be cooked', though offering of oblations precedes it is done next; for the offerings must be made with the cooked gruel. Such is the case with the words 'That' and 'thou' in the sentence 'That thou art' (तत्त्वमसि).

[3] How one is *Brahman.*

[4] 'Thou art That' etc.

[5] By the method of agreement and contrariety. See verse 96 above.

[6] See verse 96 above.

तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्येषु त्वंपदार्थाविवेकतः ।
व्यज्यते नैव वाक्यार्थो नित्यमुक्तोऽहमित्यतः ॥ १८१ ॥
अन्वयव्यतिरेकोक्तिस्तद्विवेकाय नान्यथा ।
त्वंपदार्थविवेके हि पाणावर्पितबिल्ववत् ॥ १८२ ॥
वाक्यार्थो व्यज्यते चैवं केवलोऽहंपदार्थतः ।
दुःखीत्येतदपोहेन प्रत्यगात्मविनिश्चयात् ॥ १८३ ॥

181—183. The meaning of the sentences like 'Thou art That', i.e., one is *Brahman* ever free, does not become manifest on account of the non-discrimination of the (implied) meaning of the word 'Thou'. It is for the purpose of discriminating the meaning of that word and for no other purpose that the method of agreement and contrariety has been described. For when the meaning of the word 'thou' is discriminated by the negation of the ego subject to unhappiness from the meaning[1] of the word 'I' one becomes prefectly sure of the nature of the Innermost Self. And then the meaning[2] of the sentence viz., One Pure Consciousness, becomes manifest like an *Aegle marmelos* fruit placed on one's palm.

तत्रैवं संभवत्यर्थे श्रुतहानाश्रुतार्थधीः ।
नैव कल्पयितुं युक्ता पदवाक्यार्थकोविदैः ॥ १८४ ॥

184. Those who are well-versed in the meanings of words and sentences should not, therefore, assume a meaning[3] which is not in accordance with the *Srutis*

[1] The direct meaning. See foot-note 2, verse 173.

[2] See foot-note 3, verse 173.

[3] Action (e.g., the reiteration of the idea, 'I am *Brahman*') as the direct means to right knowledge causing the cessation of Ignorance.

and give up what[1] is in them. For this explanation of the sentence[2] is thus possible.

प्रत्यक्षादीनि बाधेरन्कृष्णलादिषु पाकवत् ।
अक्षजादिनिभैरेतैः कथं स्याद्वाक्यबाधनम् ॥ १८५ ॥

185. (Objection). The knowledge 'I am *Brahman*'[3] is contradicted by sense-perception[4] etc. like the cooking of gold[5] particles.

(Reply). How can that knowledge be contradicted[6] by these which are evidences only apparently ?

दुःख्यस्मीति सति ज्ञाने निर्दुःखीति न जायते ।
प्रत्यक्षादिनिभत्वेऽपि वाक्यान्न व्यभिचारतः ॥ १८६ ॥

186. (Objection). The knowledge that one is devoid of unhappiness does not arise from the sentence as long[7] as one feels that one is unhappy, though the feeling of unhappiness may be due to sense-perception etc. which are all fallacious.

(Reply). we say 'No.' For there are exceptions.[8]

[1] Right knowledge of Self-*Brahman* arising from the sentences like 'Thou art That' and negating Ignorance.

[2] 'Thou art That.'

[3] On the part of those who hold that the idea, 'I am *Brahman*' is enjoined to be repeated for self-purification.

[4] For sense-perception, according to the objector, proves agency etc. to be in the Self.

[5] Gold particles are boiled in order to sanctify them for use in certain sacrifices.

[6] Evidently they (gold particles) do not become soft. So the word 'cooking' implies a contradiction.

[7] One feels unhappy and so on from one's birth. The knowledge, 'I am free from unhappiness' (i.e., 'I am *Brahman*') which comes later cannot, therefore, negate the previous one.

[8] E g., One feels that the sky is blue from one's birth, but one acquires the knowledge later that it is free from blueness when one is told so. See verse 3, chap 2, Metrical Part.

स्वप्ने दु:ख्यहमभ्यासं दाहच्छेदादिहेतुतः ।
तत्कालभाविभिर्वाक्यैर्न बाधः क्रियते यदि ॥ १८७ ॥
समाप्तेस्तर्हि दु:खस्य प्राक्च तद्बाध इष्यताम् ।
न हि दु:खस्य संतानो भ्रान्तेर्वा दृश्यते क्वचित् ॥ १८८ ॥

187, 188. (Reply continued). I felt miserable on account of burns, cuts, etc. in dream (and was freed[1] from pain through the teaching imparted to me by a man of knowledge in that state). Even if it be contended that the teaching in dream negates no pain, (still pain etc. cannot be regarded as belonging to the Self). For the absence of pain is there both before[2] and after[2] it is experienced, delusion or a pain being never unceasing.

प्रत्यगात्मन आत्मत्वं दु:ख्यस्मीत्यस्य बाधया ।
दशमं नवमस्येव वेद चेदविरुद्धता ॥ १८९ ॥

189. There is no contradiction if, by negating the idea that one is unhappy, one knows oneself to be the Innermost Self (i.e., *Brahman*) like the bony[3] who knew himself to be the tenth by negating the false motion that he was the ninth.

नित्यमुक्तत्वविज्ञानं वाक्याद्भवति नान्यतः ।
वाक्यार्थस्यापि विज्ञानं पदार्थस्मृतिपूर्वकम् ॥ १९० ॥
अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां पदार्थः स्मर्यते ध्रुवम् ।
एवं निर्दु:खमात्मानमक्रियं प्रतिपद्यते ॥ १९१ ॥

[1] Pain etc. are, therefore, not the properties of the Self.
[2] G. K. 2. 6.
[3] See footnote 2, verse 3, chapter 12.

190, 191. It is from the sentence only and from nothing else that one knows oneself to be ever free.[1] The meaning of the sentence is known from the knowledge of the (implied) meanings of the words ; these meanings again are surely understood by the method of agreement[2] and contrariety. Thus one knows oneself to be free from pain and action.

सदेवेत्यादिवाक्येभ्यः प्रमा स्फुटतरा भवेत् ।
दशमस्त्वमसीत्यस्माद्यथैवं प्रत्यगात्मनि ॥ १९२ ॥
प्रबोधेन यथा स्वाप्नं सर्वदुःखं निवर्तते ।
प्रत्यगात्मधिया तद्वद्दुःखित्वं सर्वदात्मनः ॥ १९३ ॥

192, 193. The right knowledge of Self-*Brahman* becomes manifest from sentences such as, 'Thou art That', like the knowledge acquired from the sentence, 'you are the tenth.' The (false) conception of pain with regard to the Self vanishes for ever when the (right) knowledge of Self-*Brahman* arises, like all kinds of pain experienced in dream which come to an end as soon as one wakes up.

कृष्णलादौ प्रमाऽजन्म तदन्यार्थाऽमृदुत्वतः ।
तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्येषु न त्वेवमविरोधतः ॥ १९४ ॥

194. The knowledge (that they have been cooked) does not arise in the case of gold[3] particles etc. as they do not become soft. They are made hot by boiling them for the purpose of producing an unseen result (in connection with sacrifices). It is not a fact

[1] I.e., *Brahman*. [2] See verse 96 above. [3] See verse 185.

that right knowledge does not arise from sentences like 'Thou art That.' For there is no such[1] contradiction here.

वाक्ये तत्त्वमसीत्यस्मिन्ज्ञातार्थं तदसिद्वयम् ।
त्वमर्थे सत्यसाहाय्याद्वाक्यं नोत्पादयेत्प्रमाम् ॥ १९५ ॥

195. The meanings of the two words 'That' and 'art' in the sentence 'Thou art that' are well-known. It does not produce right knowledge for want of help when the (implied) meaning of the word 'Thou'[2] (is not known).

तत्त्वमोस्तुल्यनीडार्थमसीत्येतत्पदं भवेत् ॥ १९६ ॥

196. The word 'art' is used in order to show that the two words 'Thou' and 'That' are in the same predicament.

तच्छब्दः प्रत्यगात्मार्थस्तच्छब्दार्थस्त्वमस्तथा ।
दुःखित्वाप्रत्यगात्मत्वं वारयेतामुभावपि ॥ १९७ ॥

197. (Being in the same predicament with the word 'Thou',) the word 'That' comes to mean the Innermost Self. (Similary, being in the same relation with the word 'That',) the word 'Thou' comes to mean the same thing as the word 'That'. (Thus in relation to each other) the two words[3] show that the Innermost Self is not unhappy and that *Brahman* is not other than the Self.

[1] As in the case of gold particles. [2] See verse 181 of this chapter. [3] See verse 171 of this chapter.

एवं च नेतिनेत्यर्थं गमयेतां परस्परम् ॥ १९८ ॥

198. Thus both of them in conjunction express the same meaning[1] as is implied by the sentence, 'Not[2] this, not this.'

एवं तत्त्वमसीत्यस्य गम्यमाने फले, कथम् ।
अप्रमाणत्वमस्योक्ता क्रियापेक्षत्वमुच्यते ॥ १९९ ॥

199. Why do you say that the sentence is not an evidence[3] (regarding the knowledge of *Brahman*) and depends on an action (in order to produce the same knowledge) as the result produced by the sentence, 'Thou art That', (is the right knowledge regarding Self-*Brahman* ?).

तस्माद्द्याद्यन्तमध्येषु कुर्वित्येतद्विरोध्यतः ।
न कल्पामोऽश्रुतत्वाच्च श्रुतत्यागोऽप्यनर्थकः ॥ २०० ॥

200. We do not, therefore, admit (the injunction of an action) in the beginning,[4] end[5] or middle.[6] For it[7] is contradictory and not met with in the *Vedas*. Not only so, we have, in that case, to give up what[8] is there in them. And that would be harmful.

[1] A Being, one and indivisible, of the nature of Bliss, Self-*Brahman*. [2] Br. U., 2. 3. 6.
[3] See verses 9, 17 and 18 above.
[4] At the time of the first teaching of the sentence 'Thou art That.' [5] At the time when direct knowledge of Self-*Brahman* has been achieved. [6] At the time of understanding the implied meanings of the words by the method of agreement and contrariety. See verse 96 of this chapter for the said method.
[7] See footnote 2, p. 272. [8] See footnote 1, p. 273.

यथानुभूयते तृप्तिर्भुजेर्वाक्यान्न गम्यते ।
वाक्यस्य विधृतिस्तद्वद्गोशकृत्पायसीक्रिया ॥ २०१ ॥

201. (Objection). The Bliss of liberation is not obtained by ascertaining the meaning of the sentence. It is not like the satisfaction which is felt by eating. Just as boiled milk-rice cannot be prepared from cow-dung, so, (the direct knowledge of *Brahman* cannot be produced) simply by ascertaining the meaning of the sentence.

सत्यमेवमनात्मार्थवाक्यात्पारोक्ष्यबोधनम् ।
प्रत्यगात्मनि न त्वेवं संख्याप्राप्तिवद्ध्रुवम् ॥ २०२ ॥

202. (Reply). Indirect knowledge, it is true, is the result produced by the sentences regarding the non-Self, but it is not so in the case of those regarding the Innermost Self. It is, on the other hand (direct and certain knowledge) like that in the case of the tenth[1] boy.

स्वयंवेद्यत्वपर्यायः स्वप्रमाणक इष्यताम् ।
निवृत्तावहमः सिद्धः स्वात्मनोऽनुभवश्च नः ॥ २०३ ॥

203. Therefore accept the Self as self-evident which means the same thing as self-knowable. The knowledge of the Innermost Self according to us thus becomes possible when the ego[2] vanishes.

बुद्धीनां विषयो दुःखं नो यस्य विषया मताः ।
कुतोऽस्य दुःखसंबन्धो दृशेः स्यात्प्रत्यगात्मनः ॥ २०४ ॥

[1] See footnote 2, verse 3, chapter 12.
[2] It vanishes when one is taught 'Thou art That.'

204. Pain is a property belonging to the intellect.[1] How can it, therefore, belong to the Innermost Self which is of the nature of Pure Consciousness and not connected with pain ?

दृशिरेवानुभूयेत स्वेनैवानुभवात्मना ।
तदाभासतया जन्म धियोऽस्यानुभवः स्मृतः ॥ २०५ ॥

205. The Witness is known by Itself[2] which is of the nature of knowledge only. It is the birth of the modification of the intellect pervaded by the reflection of Consciousness that is what is known to be the knowledge[3] of the Self.

अशनायादिनिर्मुक्तः सिद्धो मोक्षस्त्वमेव सः ।
श्रोतव्यादि तवेत्येतद्विरुद्धं कथमुच्यते ॥ २०६ ॥

206. How can you speak of the hearing[4] etc. (of the Self) on your part which is a contradiction[5] when you are (taught to be) the eternally existing Liberation[6] free from hunger etc. ?

सेत्स्यतीत्येव चेत्तत्स्याच्छ्रवणादि तदा भवेत् ।
मोक्षस्यानित्यतैवं स्याद्विरोधे नान्यथा वचः ॥ २०७ ॥

207. Hearing etc. would be necessary if Liberation were to be brought about. But It would be transitory

[1] I.e., the ego. [2] It requires, in order to be known, no other knowledge. [3] I.e., 'I am *Brahman*.' [4] Br, U., 2. 4. 5.
[5] For a man cannot be the actionless *Brahman* and at the same time the agent of hearing etc. [6] I.e., *Brahman*.

in that case. The sentence, therefore, can have no other meaning[1] which involves contradiction.

श्रोतृश्रोतव्ययोर्भेदो यदीष्टः स्याद्भवेदिदम् ।
इष्टार्थकोप एवं स्यान्न युक्तं सर्वथा वचः ॥ २०८ ॥

208. The repetition of the idea, 'I am *Brahman*' might be possible if there were a difference between the hearer (i.e. the aspirant)[2] and what is to be heard (but) the desired meaning[3] would be wronged in that case. Therefore the sentence becomes unreasonable (i.e., loses authority according to that view).

सिद्धो मोक्षोऽहमित्येव ज्ञात्वात्मानं भवेद्यदि ।
चिकीर्षुर्यः स मूढात्मा शास्त्रं चोद्घाटयत्यपि ॥ २०९ ॥

209. Knowing that one is eternally existing Liberation one who desires to perform actions[4] is a man of clouded intellect and nullifies the scriptures.

नहि सिद्धस्य कर्तव्यं सकार्यस्य न सिद्धता ।
उभयालम्बनं कुर्वन्नात्मानं वञ्चयत्यपि ॥ २१० ॥

210. For knowing oneself to be *Brahman* one has no duty to perform; nor can one be a knower of *Brahman* when one has duties to perform. One deceives oneself by having recourse to both sides.

[1] E.g., the reiteration of the idea, 'I am *Brahman*.' [2] The Self (i.e., *Brahman*) Br. U. p. 2, 4, 5. See also verse 111.
[3] That the individual Self is *Brahman*. [4] E.g., the reiteration of the idea, 'I am *Brahman*'. For the objector's contention see Verses 12 and 18 above.

सिद्धो मोक्षस्त्वमित्येतद्वस्तुमात्रं प्रदर्श्यते ।
श्रोतुस्तथात्वविज्ञाने प्रवृत्तिः स्यात्कथं त्विति ॥ २११ ॥

211. (Objection).[1] A reality is only pointed to (but no injunction is given) when one is told 'Thou art eternally existing Liberation'[2]; how can the hearer apply himself to know that he is so (without being enjoined)?

कर्ता दुःख्यहमस्मीति प्रत्यक्षेणानुभूयते ।
कर्ता दुःखी च माभूवमिति यत्नो भवेत्ततः ॥ २१२ ॥

212. It is known by perceptual evidence that one is an agent and experiencer of pain. And then there is an effort so that one may not remain so.

तद्विज्ञानाय युक्त्यादि कर्तव्यं श्रुतिरब्रवीत् ।
कर्तृत्वाद्यनुवादेन सिद्धत्वानुभवाय तु ॥ २१३ ॥

213, The *Sruti*,[3] therefore, restates the agency etc.[4] on the part of the people and enjoins duties such as reasoning etc. in order that they may know and feel that they are eternally existing (*Brahman*).

निर्दुःखो निष्क्रियोऽकामः सिद्धो मोक्षोऽहमित्यपि ।
गृहीत्वैव विरुद्धार्थमादध्यात्कथमेव सः ॥ २१४ ॥

214. (Reply). How can one accept a contradictory meaning[5] after knowing[6] that one is eternally existing

[1] Verses 211—213.
[2] *Brahman*.
[3] Br. U., 2. 4. 5.
[4] Which people are conscious of.
[5] That one is an agent.
[6] From the sentence which is the only right evidence.

Liberation which is free from unhappiness, activity and desires ?

सकामः सक्रियोऽसिद्ध इति मेऽनुभवः कथम् ।
अतो मे विपरीतस्य तद्भवान्वक्तुमर्हति ॥ २१५ ॥

215. (Objection). You should say why I, though of[1] an opposite nature, should feel that I have desires and activities and am not *Brahman*.

इहैव घटते प्रश्नो न मुक्तत्वानुभूतये ।
प्रमाणेन विरोधी यः सोऽत्रार्थः प्रश्नमर्हति ॥ २१६ ॥

216. (Reply).[2] A question on this subject[3] is reasonable, but it is not reasonable to ask why one is free. It is only a thing contrary to evidences[4] that should be questioned.

अहं निर्मुक्त इत्येव सदसीत्यन्यमानजः ।
प्रत्यक्षाभासजन्यत्वाद्दुःखित्वं प्रश्नमर्हति ॥ २१७ ॥

217. The knowledge that one is free arises from a different[5] evidence viz., the evidence, 'Thou art That.' Arising from fallacious perceptual evidence unhappiness deserves an explanation.

पृष्टमाकाङ्क्षितं वाच्यं दुःखाभावमभीप्सितम् ॥ २१८ ॥

[1] Of the nature of *Brahman*.
[2] Verses 216—228.
[3] I.e., why one feels unhappy though one is *Brahman* according to the evidence of the sentence.
[4] E.g., the sentence, 'Thou art That.'
[5] Different from perceptual evidence and so on.

218. One should be told what one asks and wants to know; and the inquirer desires to know liberation, (the Self) which is free from unhappiness.

कथं हीदं निवर्तेत दुःखं सर्वात्मना मम ।
इति प्रश्नानुरूपं यद्वाच्यं दुःखनिवर्तकम् ॥ २१९ ॥

219. That[1] which removes unhappiness should be told (by the teacher to the disciple) according to his question inquiring how his unhappiness might be removed altogether.

श्रुतेः स्वात्मनि नाशङ्का प्रामाण्ये सति विद्यते ।
तस्मादात्मविमुक्तत्वं प्रत्याययति तद्वचः ।
वक्तव्यः तत्तथार्थे स्याद्विरोधेऽसति केनचित् ॥ २२० ॥

220. There can be no doubt about what the *Srutis* prove[2] as they are an independent source of knowledge. The words of *Srutis*, therefore, produce the conviction that one is free. So it should be said that such is the meaning of the *Srutis*, as (it has been proved that) they do not contradict any other source of knowledge.

इतोऽन्योऽनुभवः कश्चिदात्मनो नोपपद्यते ।
अविज्ञातं विजानतां विज्ञातारमिति श्रुतेः ॥ २२१ ॥

221. The Knowledge of the Self different from what has been said before is unreasonable on the authority

[1] Liberation due to Self-Knowledge.
[2] Br. Sû. 1. 1. 3.

of the *Srutis*, 'It[1] is unknown to those who know It'[2] and 'Who[3] will know the knower'?

त्वंपदार्थविवेकाय संन्यासः सर्वकर्मणाम् ।
साधनत्वं व्रजत्येव शान्तो दान्तानुशासनात् ॥ २२२ ॥

222. The renunciation of all actions in order to know the (implied) meaning of the word 'thou' becomes the means (to Self-Knowledge) according to the teaching,[4] 'controlling the internal and external senses.'

त्वमर्थं प्रत्यगात्मानं पश्येदात्मानमात्मनि ।
वाक्यार्थं तत आत्मानं सर्वं पश्यति केवलम् ॥ २२३ ॥

223. One should know the Self, the innermost One, the implied meaning of the word 'thou' in the combination[5] of the body and the senses. One then knows the pure Self to be *Brahman*, the all-comprehensive principle. And that is the meaning of the sentence, 'Thou art That.'

सर्वमात्मेति वाक्यार्थे विज्ञातेऽस्य प्रमाणतः ।
असत्त्वे ह्यन्यमानस्य विधिस्तं योजयेत्कथम् ॥ २२४ ॥

224. How can one be enjoined to perform a duty when the meaning of the sentence, viz., one is *Brahman*, is known by one according to the right source of

[1] Ke. U., 2. 3.
[2] To be an object of Knowledge.
[3] Br. U., 2. 4. 14.
[4] Br. U., 4. 4. 23.
[5] As its witness.

knowledge, the *Srutis*, inasmuch as no[1] other source of knowledge can then exist for one?

तस्माद्वाक्यार्थविज्ञानान्नोर्ध्वं कर्मविधिर्भवेत् ।
नहि ब्रह्मास्मि कर्तेति विरुद्धे भवतो धियौ ॥ २२५ ॥

225. No actions can, therefore, be enjoined on one when one has known the meaning of the sentence.[2] For the two contradictory ideas, 'I am *Brahman*' and 'I am an agent' cannot exist together.

ब्रह्मास्मीति च विद्येयं नेत्र कर्तेति बाध्यते ।
सकामो बद्ध इत्येवं प्रमाणाभासजातया ॥ २२६ ॥
शास्त्राद्ब्रह्मास्मि नान्योऽहमिति बुद्धिर्भवेद्दृढा ।
यदाऽयुक्ता तदैवं धीर्यथा देहात्मधीरिति ॥ २२७ ॥

226, 227. That one is *Brahman* is the right knowledge. It is not negated by the false conceptions that one is an agent, has desires and is bound arising from fallacious evidences. This (false) knowledge (i.e., I am an agent), like the identification[3] of the Self with the body, becomes unreasonable when the knowledge that one is *Brahman* and not other than It is firmly grasped according to (the teaching of) the scriptures.

सभयादभयं प्राप्तस्तदर्थं यतते च यः ।
स पुनः सभयं गन्तुं स्वतन्त्रश्चेन्न गच्छति ॥ २२८ ॥

228. A man who tries to remain free from fear after going to a place devoid of it from one full of fear does not, if independent, go to a place of fear again.

[1] They are then all proved to be unreal.
[2] 'Thou art That.'
[3] The idea, 'I am a man.'

यथेष्टाचरणप्राप्तिः संन्यासादिविधौ कुतः ।
पदार्थज्ञानबुद्धस्य वाक्यार्थानुभवार्थिनः ॥ २२९ ॥

229. How can there be the possibility of wrong conduct[1] on the part of one on whom renunciation etc.[2] are enjoined and who is awakened on knowing the implied meanings of the words[3] and aspiring[4] after the comprehension of the meaning of the sentence[5] ?

अतः सर्वमिदं सिद्धं यत्प्रागस्माभिरीरितम् ॥ २३० ॥

230. Everything, therefore, that we said before, is substantiated.

यो हि यस्माद्विरक्तः स्यान्नासौ तस्मै प्रवर्तते ।
लोकत्रयाद्विरक्तत्वान्मुमुक्षुः किमितीहते ॥ २३१ ॥

231. One does not try to attain anything in which one has lost interest. Why will a man seeking[6] liberation make any effort at all who has lost interest in all the three worlds ?

क्षुधया पीड्यमानोऽपि न विषं ह्यत्तुमिच्छति ।
मिष्टान्नध्वस्ततृड् जानन्नामूढस्तं जिघत्सति ॥ २३२ ॥

[1] For objection see verses 12 and 16, chap. 18.

[2] Including the injunctions of hearing, reflecting and meditating on the Self.

[3] The words, 'thou' and 'that.'

[4] Therefore wrong conduct is impossible on one's part as one's mind is occupied with the attempt.

For one again who has rightly comprehended the meaning of the sentence, wrong conduct is of course absolutely impossible.

[5] 'Thou art That.'

[6] Even one seeking liberation is free from desires and efforts ; how much more free is one who has obtained it ?

232. No one likes to eat poison even if pressed by hunger. So, no one who is not an idiot will knowingly wish to eat it when his hunger has been appeased by eating sweatmeats.

वेदान्तवाक्यपुष्पेभ्यो ज्ञानामृतमधूत्तमम् ।
उज्जहारालिवद्यो नस्तस्मै सद्गुरवे नमः ॥ २३३ ॥

233. I bow down to my Teacher, a knower of *Brahman*, who collected for us the nectar of knowledge from the *Vedântas* like a bee collecting the best honey from flowers.

अथात्ममनःसंवादप्रकरणम् ॥ १९ ॥

CHAPTER XIX

A CONVERSATION BETWEEN THE SELF AND THE MIND

प्रयुज्य तृष्णाज्वरनाशकारणं चिकित्सितं ज्ञानविराग-
भेषजम्। न याति कामज्वरसन्निपातजां शरीरमालां
शतयोगदुःखिताम् ॥ १ ॥

1. One does not meet with the distress caused by a series of hundreds of bodies, which has its origin in a swoon due to the fever of desires if one places oneself under the treatment in which medicines are Knowledge and dispassion, the causes of the destruction of the fever of desires (mentioned before).

अहं ममेति त्वमनर्थमीहसे परार्थमिच्छन्ति तवान्य
ईहितम्। न तेऽर्थबोधो न हि मेऽस्ति चार्थिता
ततश्च युक्तः शम एव ते मनः ॥ २ ॥

2. Oh my mind, you indulge in vain ideas like 'me' and 'mine.' Your efforts, according to others,[1]

[1] The Sânkhyas.

are for one[1] other than yourself. You have no consciousness of things and I have no desire of having anything. It is, therefore, proper for you to remain quiet.

यतो न चान्यः परमात्मसनातनात्सदैव तृप्तोऽहमतो न
मेऽर्थिता । सदैव तृप्तश्च न कामये हितं यतस्व चेतः
प्रशमाय ते हितम् ॥ ३ ॥

3. As I am no other than the Supreme Eternal One I am always contented and have no desires. Always contented I desire no welfare for myself, but I wish your welfare. Try to make yourself quiet, Oh mind.

षडूर्मिमालाभ्यतिवृत्त एव यः स एव चात्मा जगतश्च नः
श्रुतेः । प्रमाणतश्चापि मया प्रवेद्यते मुधैव तस्माच्च
मनस्तवेहितम् ॥ ४ ॥

4. One who is by nature beyond the six continual waves[2] is, according to the evidence of the *Srutis*, the Self of us and the universe. This is what I know from other[3] sources of knowledge also. Your efforts are, therefore, all in vain.

त्वयि प्रशान्ते नहि चास्ति भेदधीर्यतो जगन्मोहमुपैति
मायया । ग्रहो हि मायाप्रभवस्य कारणं ग्रहाद्विमोके
नहि सास्ति कस्यचित् ॥ ५ ॥

[1] The *Purusha*, the Self (according to the *Sânkhyas*).
[2] (1) Hunger and (2) thirst, the properties of the vital force, (3) grief and (4) delusion, of the mind, (5) old age and (6) death, of the body.
[3] E.g., Bh. Gîtâ, 10. 20.

5. There is no idea of difference left deluding people through wrong notions when you are merged.[1] For the cause of all wrong notions is the perception of (the reality of) difference. These wrong notions vanish as soon as one is free from this perception.

न मेऽस्ति मोहस्तव चेष्टितेन हि प्रबुद्धतत्त्वस्त्वसितो ह्यविक्रियः । न पूर्वतत्त्वोत्तरभेदता हि नो वृथैव तस्माच्च मनस्तवेहितम् ॥ ६ ॥

6. I am not deluded by your efforts. For I have known the Truth and am free from all bondage and change. I have no difference in the conditions preceding the knowledge of Truth and succeeding it. Your efforts, oh mind, are, therefore, useless.

यतश्च नित्योऽहमतो न चान्यथा विकारयोगे हि भवेद्-नित्यता । सदा प्रभातोऽहमतो हि चाद्वयो विकल्पितं चाप्यसदित्यवस्थितम् ॥ ७ ॥

7. As I am eternal I am not otherwise. Transitoriness is due to the connection with changes. I am always self-effulgent and therefore without a second. It is ascertained that everything created (by the mind) is non-existent.

अभावरूपं त्वमसीह हे मनो निरीक्ष्यमाणे न हि युक्तितो-ऽस्तिता । सतो ह्यनाशादसतोऽप्यजन्मतो द्वयं च चेतस्तव नास्तितेष्यते ॥ ८ ॥

[1] In Ignorance e.g., in deep sleep.

8. Scrutinised through the reasoning that reality[1] is never destroyed and unreality never born you have no (real) existence. You are, therefore, Oh my mind, non-existent in the Self. Having both birth and death you are accepted as non-existent.

द्रष्टा च दृश्यं च तथा च दर्शनं भ्रमस्तु सर्वस्तव
कल्पितो हि सः। दृशेश्च भिन्नं न हि दृश्यमीक्ष्यते
स्वपन्प्रबोधेन तथा न भिद्यते ॥ ९ ॥

विकल्पना वापि तथाद्वया भवेदवस्तुयोगात्तदलातचक्रवत्।
न शक्तिभेदोऽस्ति यतो न चात्मनां ततोऽद्वयत्वं श्रुति-
तोऽवसीयते ॥ १० ॥

9, 10. As everything—the seer, seeing and the seen—is a false notion superimposed by you and as no object of perception is known to have an existence independent of that of the Self, (the Self is one only). When this is so, the Self in the state of deep sleep[2] does not differ from Itself when in waking (or dream). Unreal like the circular[3] form of a burning torch superimposition also[4] (has no existence independent of that of) the non-dual Self. The oneness of the Self is ascertained from the *Srutis* as the Self has no division within Itself on account of different powers[5] and as It is not different (in different bodies).

[1] See Bh. Gîtâ, 2. 16.
[2] The non-dual Self only exists in deep sleep. See Br. U., 4. 3. 32.
[3] When it is moved round.
[4] Like the seer, seeing and the seen which are superimposed.
[5] See Br. U. 4. 3. 23—30.

मिथश्च भिन्ना यदि ते हि चेतनाः क्षयस्तु तेषां परि-
माणयोगतः । ध्रुवो भवेद्भेदवतां हि दृष्टतो जगत्क्षय-
श्चापि समस्तमोक्षतः ॥ ११ ॥

11. If, according to you, souls were mutually different and so limited (by one another) they would meet with destruction as all such things are seen to come to an end. Again, all being liberated, the whole world would meet with extinction.

न मेऽस्ति कश्चिन्न च सोऽस्मि कस्यचिद्यतोऽद्वयोऽहं
न हि चास्ति कल्पितम् । अकल्पितश्चास्मि पुरा प्रसि-
द्धितो विकल्पनाया द्वयमेव कल्पितम् ॥ १२ ॥

12. There is no one who belongs to me nor is there anyone to whom I belong as I am without a second. The (world which is) superimposed does not exist. My existence[1] being known to be anterior to superimposition, I am not superimposed. It is duality only that is so.

विकल्पना चाप्यभवे न विद्यते सदन्यदित्येवमतो न
नास्तिता । यतः प्रवृत्ता तव चापि कल्पना पुरा
प्रसिद्धेर्न च तद्विकल्पितम् ॥ १३ ॥

13. The unborn Self[2] can never be regarded as non-existent because there cannot be the superimposition of existence or non-existence on It. What exists

[1] The Final substratum of all superimposition.
[2] The Self, the substratum of all superimposition.

prior to your coming into (apparent) existence and on which you yourself are superimposed cannot Itself be superimposed.

असद्द्वयं तेऽपि हि यद्यदीक्ष्यते न दृष्टमित्येव न चैव
नास्तिता । यतः प्रवृत्ता सदसद्विकल्पना विचारवद्वापि
तथाद्वयं च सत् ॥ १४ ॥

14. The duality pervaded by you is unreal. That It is not seen is no reason that the Self does not exist. That from which the wrong notions of existence and non-existence proceed[1] (must exist). And just as a deliberation ends in a conclusion, so, (all things superimposed have a final substratum) in the really existing and non-dual Self.

सदभ्युपेतं भवतोपकल्पितं विचारहेतोर्यदि तस्य नास्ति-
ता । विचारहानाच्च तथैव संस्थितं न चेत्तदिष्टं नितरां
सदिष्यते ॥ १५ ॥

15. If the duality, created by you and assumed by us to be real so that an investigation of the Truth might be possible, were non-existent[2] Truth would remain unascertained owing to the investigation becoming impossible. The existence[3] of a reality must be accepted as a matter of course if an unascertained nature of Truth is not desirable.

[1] I.e., are superimposed on It. See verse 16, chapter 16.

[2] A void.

[3] Non-dual existence which is common to all dual phenomena must be accepted as real. But excluding one another, phenomena themselves are not persistent in their existence and are, therefore, unreal. See Sankara's Commentary on Bh. Gîtâ, 2. 16.

असत्समं चैव सदित्यपीति चेदनर्थवत्त्वान्नरशृङ्गतुल्यतः। अनर्थवत्त्वं त्वसति ह्यकारणं न चैव तस्मान्न विपर्ययेऽन्यथा ॥ १६ ॥

16. (Objection). What is called real [1] is, as a matter of fact, unreal like a human horn as it does not serve [2] any purpose. (Reply). That a thing serves no purpose is no reason why it should be unreal and that a thing serves some purpose is no reason, on the other hand, why it should be real.

असिद्धतश्चापि विचारकारणाद्द्वयं च तस्मात्प्रसृतिं च मायया। श्रुतेः स्मृतेश्चापि तथा हि युक्तितः प्रसिद्ध्यतीत्थं न तु युज्यतेऽन्यथा ॥ १७ ॥

17. Your inference is wrong (because reality serves some purpose) as It is the subject-matter of deliberation and also the source of all duality proceeding from It under the influence of *Mâyâ*, according to the *Srutis*,[3] the *Smritis*[4] and reason[5]. Thus it is reasonable (that the Self, though changeless, serves some purpose). Otherwise (i.e., as a matter of *reality*) it is not reasonable (that a thing, either permanent or momentary, serves any purpose).

विकल्पनाच्चापि विधर्मकं श्रुतेः पुरा प्रसिद्धेश्च विकल्पतोऽद्वयः। न चेति नेतीति यथा विकल्पितं निषिध्यतेऽत्राप्यवशेषसिद्धये ॥ १८ ॥

[1] In the *Vedas*. [2] In the opposite case it becomes momentary according to the objector. [3] Sw. U., 4. 10.
[4] Bh. Gîtâ., 9. 10. [5] Chh. U. 6. 1. 4—6.

18. According to the *Sruti*[1] It is of a nature contrary to that of superimposition. This One is without a second as It is also known to have an eternal existence even prior to all superimposition. Unlike everything superimposed on It, which is negated on the evidence of the *Sruti*,[2] 'Not this, not this', It is not negated and, therefore, left over.

अकल्पितेऽप्येवमजेऽद्वयेऽक्षरे विकल्पयन्तः सदसच्च जन्मभिः । स्वचित्तमायाप्रभवं च ते भवं जरां च मृत्युं च नियान्ति संततम् ॥ १९ ॥

19. Those who, owing to false notions in their own minds, superimpose the ideas of existence, non-existence, etc.[3] on the Self which is not Itself superimposed and is birthless, imperishable and without a second always meet with birth, old age and death as different kinds of beings.

भवाभवत्वं तु न चेदवस्थितिर्न चास्य चान्यस्थितिजन्म नान्यथा । सतो ह्यसत्त्वादसतश्च सत्त्वतो न च क्रिया कारकमित्यतोऽप्यजम् ॥ २० ॥

20. (Duality) can have no reality if both its birth and absence of birth are denied (owing to the possibility of contradictions). Again it cannot owe its origin[4] to another thing either real or unreal. For in that case, (being the origin of duality) reality would become

[1] Sw. U., 6. 19. [2] Br. U., 2. 3. 6.
[3] Qualified, non-qualified, agent, non-agent and so on.
[4] See G. K. 4. 22 and 4. 40.

unreal[1] and unreality real.[2] Hence the nature of actions and their instruments[3] also (cannot be ascertained). It is for these reasons that the Self is (ascertained to be) unborn.

अकुर्वदिष्टं यदि वास्य कारकं न किंचिदन्यन्नतु नास्त्य-
कारकम् । सतोऽविशेषादसतश्च सच्च्युतौ तुलान्त-
योर्यद्वदनिश्चयान्न हि ॥ २१ ॥

21. If the instruments in connection with the birth of duality be considered to be devoid of any action whatever there will be nothing (which will not be an instrument). (And if they are considered to have the power of action) they will not be instruments. (For they can be acting neither) in the state of reality nor of unreality as both these states are without any particulars (and will always produce effects or never produce any). Neither[4] can they become instruments *at the time*[5] of their deviation from their original states (of reality or unreality). For (in that case the distinction between the nature of the cause and that of the effect) cannot be ascertained like (the relation of cause and effect) between the two ends (moving up and down) of the beam of a balance.

[1] For all material causes are changeable and, therefore, unreal.

[2] For a material cause cannot but have some existence; it cannot be a void.

[3] Regarding the production of duality.

[4] If you argue that reality or unreality may have the power of action when they deviate from the previous states (of reality or unreality).

[5] Nor can they be instruments *after* such deviation. For deviation itself being an effect requires something to produce it, that again something else and so on. There will thus be a *regressus ad infinitum*.

न चेत्स इष्टः सदसद्विपर्ययः कथं भवः स्यात्सदसद्व्यव-
स्थितौ । विभक्तमेतद्द्वयमप्यव्यवस्थितं न जन्म तस्माच्च
मनो हि कस्यचित् ॥ २२ ॥

22. If the reversal of reality and unreality is not desirable how can anything owe its origin to them which are of a fixed nature ? For both of them stand without having any connection with each other. Nothing,[1] therefore, Oh my mind, is born.[2]

अथाभ्युपेत्यापि भवं तवेच्छतो ब्रवीमि नार्थस्तव चेष्टि-
तेन मे । न हानवृद्धी न यतः स्वतोऽसतो भवोऽन्यतो
वा यदि वास्तिता तयोः ॥ २३ ॥

23. Even by assuming the birth (of things), if you like so, I say your efforts serve me no purpose. For not existing in the Self gain or loss cannot be there either uncaused or due to any cause. Even assuming that they exist (in the Self, it is a fact that your efforts are of no use[3] to me).

ध्रुवा ह्यनित्याश्च न चान्ययोगिनो मिथश्च कार्यं न च
तेषु युज्यते । अतो न कस्यापि हि किंचिदिष्यते
स्वयं च तत्त्वं न निरुक्तिगोचरम् ॥ २४ ॥

[1] G. K. 4. 4, 10, 28 and 46.

[2] In the previous verse a change of condition in reality and unreality was assumed. But as a matter of fact there is no such change.

[3] In the case of their existence your effort to produce them is futile.

24. Things either immutable or transitory cannot have any relation with other things or with themselves. Therefore it is not reasonable that they should have any effects. So nothing belongs to anything else. The Self Itself is also not (directly) within the scope of words.[1]

समं तु तस्मात्सततं विभातवद्द्वयाद्विमुक्तं सदसद्वि-
कल्पितात् । निरीक्ष्य युक्त्या श्रुतितस्तु बुद्धिमानशेष-
निर्वाणमुपैति दीपवत् ॥ २५ ॥

25. A wise man immediately meets with the complete extinction of bondage like the (extinguishing of) a lamp when he knows through reasoning and the *Srutis* (the Self) which is the same in all conditions, always of the nature of self-effulgent Consciousness and free from duality fancied to be existing or non-existing.

अवेद्यमेकं यदनन्यवेदिनां कुतार्किकाणां च सुवेद्य-
मन्यथा । निरीक्ष्य चेत्थं त्वगुणग्रहोऽगुणं न याति
मोहं ग्रहदोषमुक्तितः ॥ २६ ॥

26. Knowing the One bereft of the *gunas* which is unknowable[2] according to those who know It to be not different from the Self and which is very well knowable[2] according to those fallaciously argumentative people who wrongly know It to be an object of knowledge a man, thus freed from the *Gunas*, becomes liberated from the bondage of false notions and is never deluded (again).

[1] This is stated in answer to the objection that being an object of *Vedic* evidence the Self is related with the *Vedas*. See verses 29, 30, Ch. 18.

[2] Ke. U., 2. 3.

अतोऽन्यथा न ग्रहनाश इष्यते विमोहबुद्धेर्ग्रह एव
कारणम् । ग्रहोऽप्यहेतुस्त्वनलस्त्वनिन्धनो यथा
प्रशान्तिं परमां तथा व्रजेत् ॥ २७ ॥

27. False notions cannot be negated in any way other than (thus knowing the Self). It is these wrong notions that are the causes of delusion. These notions, bereft of their cause,[1] come to an absolute end, like fire bereft of fuel, (when knowledge is achieved).

विमथ्य वेदोदधितः समुद्धृतं सुरैर्महाब्धेस्तु यथा महा-
त्मभिः । तथाऽमृतं ज्ञानमिदं हि यैः पुरा नमो
गुरुभ्यः परमीक्षितं च यैः ॥ २८ ॥

इति श्रीमत्परमहंसपरिव्राजकाचार्यश्रीगोविन्दभगवत्पूज्य-
शिष्यस्य श्रीशंकरभगवतः कृतिः सकलवेदोप-
निषत्सारोपदेशसाहस्री समाप्ता

28. I bow down to the teachers, the great souls who realized the Supreme Truth and gathered from the ocean of the *Vedas* this knowledge (described in the present book) like gods who churned the great ocean in ancient time and gathered nectar.

Here ends *A Thousand Teachings*, the substance of all the *Upanishats* written by the All-knowing Sankara, the Teacher and wandering *Paramahamsa*,[2] the disciple of Govinda worthy of adoration.

[1] Ignorance.

[2] A man who has renounced worldly action and has the surest Knowledge that he is not different from *Brahman* and that the universe is unreal, wandering from place to place for the spiritual benefit of people.

INDEX TO VERSES

PART II